84 J. Morse

A CONTINUATION AND VINDICATION OF THE DEFENCE OF *Dr.* Stillingfleet's *Unreasonableness of Separation:*

IN ANSWER

To Mr. *Baxter*, Mr. *Lob*, &c.

Containing

A further Explication and Defence of the Doctrine of Catholick Communion.

A Confutation of the groundless Charge of *Cassandrianism.* [Some Acct of Cassander 198]

The Terms of Catholick Communion, and the Doctrine of Fundamentals explained.

Together with a brief Examination of Mr. *Humphrey*'s Materials for Union.

Thomas Long Dr Sherlock afterward Dean of Paul's.

By the Author of the Defence.

Dr Wm Sherlock See Wood's Ath. Vol 2 P 952

LONDON, Printed for *R. Chiswell*, at the *Rose* and *Crown* in St. *Paul's*-Churchyard. MDCLXXXII.

THE PREFACE.

I Have already writ a Book so much bigger, than I at first designed it, that I shall not trouble my Readers with a long Preface. I have carefully examined, and I think, have fully answered, all that I could think material in my Adversaries Objections. I can honestly say this for my self, that I have overlooked nothing, because I thought it difficult to return a satisfactory Answer to it, though, I confess, I have slighted some trifling Objections, as unworthy of an Answer. Had I been merrily

rily diſpoſed, I could have given my Readers great Diverſion, by expoſing the folly of Mr. *Lob*, a very bold, but a very ignorant Writer. But I thought it a little thing to inſult and triumph over ſo mean an Adverſary, and an unpardonable affront to the judgment of Mankind, to attempt to prove, that the Church of *England* did not begin the War againſt the King; that the Diſſenters, by their unreaſonable Oppoſition to the Church of *England*, give great advantage to the Papiſts to accompliſh their deſigns: That the Papiſts are hearty Enemies to the Order of Biſhops in the Church of *England*, and would gladly deſtroy the Proteſtant Epiſcopacy: That Queen *Elizabeth* of bleſſed Memory was not inclined to Popery, nor deſigned to reduce the Church of *England* to a nearer Con-

Conformity to the Church of *Rome*. I did preſume, that all Mr. *Lob's* Wit or Sophiſtry, could never perſwade the *Engliſh* World to believe otherwiſe, and therefore thought it to no purpoſe to ſpend Ink and Paper, and ſome precious hours in ſo needleſs a Work. As for Mr. *Baxter* (notwithſtanding the grave and ſevere Reprimand, which Mr. *Humphrey* gives the Dean for it) I am mightily inclined to pity him; he has diſputed himſelf out of all ſence, and all good manners, and I think there is the leaſt Reaſon to anſwer his Books, of any man's I know, for I believe very few People underſtand what he would have himſelf, or what there is in them to be anſwered; what his Name and Authority may do, I cannot tell, but I fancy, his meer Writings will never make any Proſelyte

one way or other. However I have considered, whatever I could judge worth answering, and have been at more trouble to find out what his Objection was, than to find an Answer to it.

He has been pleased to give me a Name, though I did not think fit to publish it my self, and whether he guess right or wrong, he shall never know from me. And yet, as I remember, the Country Conformist blames me for publishing Mr. *Lob*'s and Mr. *Humphrey*'s Names, because they had not owned them themselves, though Mr. *Baxter* had done it for them. But it was not enough to publish my Name, unless he could give a History of my Life too, which, I thank God, has been at least to outward appearance, so innocent, that if he knew me, I fear not his most malicious and spiteful Comments.

I ſhall only tell him, that Dr. *Sherlock*, whom I know very well, preſents his ſervice to him, and aſſures him, that he can tell a more pleaſant ſtory of his Adventures at *Acton*, and the Hiſtory of the Letter, than he has done, but is not willing to ſet up the Trade of writing Intelligences, nor concerning the World, in all the Privacies of Converſations. Only he wonders, what Temptation Mr. *Baxter* had, either to Print *his own Letter*, which had been ſufficiently anſwered long ſince, or to Print his Letter, which contained ſo little Ceremony or Complement to him; it being the firſt time, that he remembers, Mr. *Baxter* guilty of Printing any private Lerter, which did not groſly flatter him. In ſhort, that Doctor aſſures him, that if he have a mind to revive that old Controverſie,

Defence of the knowledg of Jeſus Chriſt.

verſie, which his other Adverſaries have been pleaſed to forget, he is contented to enter the Liſts once more.

I ſhall only further acquaint my Readers, that I have taken all the care I can, that they ſhall not wholly loſe their time, if they pleaſe to peruſe this Vindication; for I have ſought all Occaſions of uſeful Diſcourſe, and have found many. And would but my Adverſaries read this Diſcourſe with as great freedom and impartiality, as I uſed in writing it, poſſibly we might in time ſee an end of theſe Controverſies, in a happy Union of Proteſtants, in the Communion of the Church of *England*.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

Concerning Catholick Unity, p. 1
The misrepresentation Mr. Baxter *and Mr.* Lob *have made of that Doctrine,* ibid.
The occasion of that Discourse of Church Unity and Communion, 3
A brief account of the Doctrine of the Defence, concerning one Catholick Church, 12
Whether the Catholick Church be in order of Nature antecedent to particular Churches, and Mr. Lob's *Cavils answered,* 14

Chap. 2.

Concerning Catholick Communion, 30
Mr. Baxter's *Objections answered,* 32
Mr. Baxter's *Notion of a Catholick Church, and how it is formed,* 41
The Authority of Arch-Bishop Bramhall, *Mr.* Hooker, *and Dr.* Field, *alledged against me by Mr.* Lob, *and their judgment in these points considered, and reconciled with the Doctrine of the Defence,* 53

In what ſence Schiſmaticks, Hereticks, Idolaters, may be owned members of the viſible Church of Chriſt, 61

An Hiſtorical account of the ſtate of the Controverſie, about the re-baptization of Hereticks, as far as it concerns the Doctrine of Catholick Communion, 72

Chap. 3.

Concerning the neceſſity of Catholick Communion. Wherein is proved at large, that the Communion of the Church is ordinarily neceſſary to a ſtate of Salvation, 87

Chap. 4.

Concerning the Unity of Church-Power, 120

The Inſinuation of a Caſſandrian *deſign for Union with the Church of* Rome, 121

The Doctrine of the Defence, conſidered with reference to the Unity of Church-Power, wherein the Charge of Caſſandrianiſm *is founded,* 122

What the Opinion of Caſſander *was about Church-Power and Government,* 130

Thoſe who renounce the Authority of the Pope, can be no Papiſts, though they aſſert the Authority of General Councils, 132

The judgment of the Councils of Conſtance *and* Baſil, *in this point,* 133

The judgment of Petrus de Marca, *Arch-Biſhop of* Paris, *concerning the Liberties of the* Gallican *Churches,* 137

Mr. Lob's *Accuſation anſwered, that I make the univerſal Church the firſt Seat of Government, or*

a Political Organized Body, in which there is one Supreme and Soveraign Power over the whole, 142

Whether I make the Church of England *accountable to Foreign Bishops,* 150

Whether I subject the Church of England *to a General Council,* 160

Whether to assert the Authority of General Councils, subverts the King's Supremacy, and incurs a Premunire, [Art. 21st.] 168

Mr. Lob's *honesty in charging me with owning the Supremacy of the Bishop of* Rome, 172

The Contradictions Mr. Baxter *chargeth me with, considered,* 175

The Reason of Mr. B.'s *Zeal for a constitutive Regent Head of the Church,* 178

The distinction of a National Church, considered as a Church, and as incorporated into the State, vindicated from Mr. Humphrey's *Objections,* 188

Concerning the constitutive Regent Head of the Church of England, *and whether a National Church be a Political Body and Society,* 200

Mr. Humphrey's *Argument to prove a Constitutive Regent Head of the Church of* England, *examined,* 209

The difference between Aristocracy, *and the Government of the Church by Bishops, without a Regent Head,* 216

A Vindication of the Dean's Argument, against the necessity of a constitutive Regent Head of a National Church. 219

a Schoms of ye Author's Principles upon which he opposes mr B & mr H. 182.

Chap.

Chap. 5.

Concerning that one Communion, which is essential to the Catholick Church, and the practicableness of it, p. 226

In what sence Catholick Communion requires the Agreement and Concord of the Bishops of the Catholick Church among themselves, and with each other, [*Quarrel of some ancient Bps* 231] 227

The several ways of maintaining Catholick Communion used in the ancient Church, vindicated from Mr. B.'s Objections, 232

What place there can be for Catholick Communion, in this broken and divided state of the Church, 239

That there are Schisms in the Church, is no Arguments against the necessity of Catholick Communion, 240

Catholick Communion not impracticable in its own Nature, 242

Communion necessary to be maintained between all sound and orthodox Churches, 243

Not many positive Acts of Communion, necessary to maintain Catholick Communion between foreign Churches, 245

The Terms of Catholick Communion very practicable, 247

A Discourse of Fundamental Doctrines, 248

What a Fundamental Doctrine is: Salvation by Christ, the general fundamental of Christianity, 256

The Doctrine of the holy Trinity, a Fundamental of Christian Faith, 259

The denial of Christ's Divinity makes a Fundamental

* viz. 1. Doctrine; 2. Government; 3. Discipline; 4. Laws, Rites & Customs

mental change in the Doctrine of Salvation by Christ, [9th Denial of 4th H. G's Divinity of same 271] 261
School subtilties about the Trinity, not fundamental Doctrines, nor the dispute about the Filioq, 273
The Doctrine of Christ's Incarnation, &c. fundamental, 274
What is Fundamental in the Doctrine of Salvation it self, [we are dangerous, but not fund^tl Errors 292] 281
Mr. Mede's Notion of Fundamentals, 300
Whether an influence upon a good Life be the proper Ratio or Notion of a Fundamental Doctrine, 305
Whether a Church, which professes to believe all Fundamentals, but yet entertains such corrupt Doctrines, as in their immediate and necessary Consequences overthrow Foundations, may be said to err fundamentally, 316
And in what cases we may communicate with such a Church, [Antinomian Doctrines 321] 319
How far it is lawful to communicate with Churches not governed by Bishops, nor by Presbyters ordained by Bishops, 329
A great difference between the case of our Dissenters, and some foreign Protestant Churches upon this account, 331
Their Case more largely considered, 337
Concerning Church Discipline and Ecclesiastical Rites and Ceremonies, considered as Terms of Catholick Communion, 371

Chap. 6.

An examination of Mr. Lob's suggestions, to prove the Dissenters, according to my own Principles,

ples, to be no Schismaticks, and a further inquiry, who is the Divider, p. 382
Whether Dissenters separate from the Catholick Church, 383
Whether Separation from the Church of England *infer a Separation from the Catholick Church,* 387
Whether nothing can be a Term of Communion, but what is a necessary part of true Religion, 394
Whether the Church of England *makes indifferent things necessary to Salvation,* 404
Whether the Church of England *unjustly excommunicates Dissenters, and may be charged with Schism upon that account,* 413
The Answer, which was given in the Defence to Mr. Lob's *Argument, whereby he proves the Church to be the Divider, vindicated from his Exceptions,* 420

Chap. 7.

Mr. Humphrey's *Materials for Union examined,* 442
His Materials for Union destroy the present Constitution of the Church of England, *which is a very modest proposal in Dissenters, to pull down the Church for Union,* 443
He sets up no National Church in the room of it, 447
His Project will cure no Schism, and therefore can make no Union, 456
Nor is it a likely way so much as to preserve the external Peace and Union of the Nation, 459

Corrupt & erroneous Doctrines, wch are neither ~~nor~~ fundamental Errors, nor introduce any such fundamental Corruptions into religious Worship, need not break Communion, p. 324. The Errors of any Ch. cant make it's Commn Sinful, unless they make it's Worship Ep. p. 325. variety of opinions, (while we agree in Fund of Faith & Essentials of Worship) consistent wth Catholick Communion. p. 326.

ERRATA.

PAge 4. line 3. read *Tendency*, p. 18. l. 15. for Doctor & *Docetæ* or *Docitæ*. p. 31. l. 20. for *is a desperate*, r. *is of a desperate*. p. 45. l. 4. r. *spick*. p. 52. l. 20. r. *invisibly*. p. 71. l. 6. for *or thought* r. *are thought*. p. 73. Marg. for *ex*. 52. r. *ep*. 52. p. 77. Marg. for *ingenuit*. r. *ingemuit*. p. 79. Marg: *A Citation out of St.* Austin *divided in the middle, must be read together*. p. 89. l. 22. for *promisingr. premising*. p. 106. l. 22. for *of*, r. *or*. p. 123. l. 2. dele *also*. p. 139. Marg. for *litera*, r. *litura*. l. 9. for *Cevernment*, r. *Government*. p. 141. l. 24. for *that*, r. *yet*. p. 194. l. 4. for *present* r. *prudent*. p. 226. l. 7. r. *are*. l. 22. r. *it*. p. 235. l. 20. for *uses*, r. *cases*. p. 243. l. 28. dele *two*. p. 254. l. 20. for *observe*, r. *obscure*. p. 273. l. 11. r. *Personality*. p. 347. Marg. for *Ecclesia authoritas*, r. *constituit ecclesiæ auctoritas*. p. 356. l. 16. r. *Delegation*. p. 358. l. 11. r. ὀπτελεῖν. p. 381. l. 29. for *there*, r. *these*. p. 392. l. 12. r. *the Catholick Church*. p. 393. l. 18. r. *with it*. p. 421. l. 9. dele *what*. p. 464. l. 29. r. *help it*.

A VINDICATION OF THE DEFENCE OF *Dr.* Stillingfleet's *Unreaſonableneſs of Separation.*

CHAP. I.

Concerning Catholick Unity.

IN my Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Unreaſonableneſs of Separation, I have aſſerted (and proved, for any thing I ſee yet objected to the contrary) that Chriſt has but one Church on Earth, and that the Unity of this Church conſiſts in one *Catholick* Communion: Mr. *B.* Mr. *Lob*, and Mr. *Humphrey*, inſtead of giving a fair Anſwer

Cap. 1. to this, have endeavoured to affix ſuch a ſenſe on my words, as I never thought of, nay, as is directly contrary to the avowed Doctrine of that Book; and when they have turned every thing into non-ſenſe and confuſion by their own ſenſeleſs Comments, they ſet up a great Cry of *Caſſandrianiſm* and Contradictions. *inf. p. 120, 130.*

For my part, when I read thoſe Repreſentations theſe Men had made of my Notions, I wondred to find my ſelf ſuch a ſtranger to my ſelf. I was perfectly ignorant of the whole buſineſs and Intrigue, and began to examine, whether I had expreſſed any thing ſo unwarily, as to lead them into ſuch Miſtakes; but upon inquiry, I found, it was nothing but the laſt weak Efforts of a dying Cauſe, like the works and doublings of a Hare, when ſhe is near run down, to loſe the Scent. For this is the conſtant Artifice of theſe men, when they are no longer able to defend their Cauſe, to ſtart aſide, and by one Art or other, to looſe their firſt Queſtion in ſome new Diſpute. Thus Mr. *B.* tells us for a Concluſion, *I intend, God willing, hereafter to let the Matters of meer Conformity comparatively alone, and further to examine this fundamental Diffe-*

Difference, ſeeing it is evident, that now Satan's deſign is to call the French Popery by the name of the Proteſtant Religion, and the Proteſtant Religion of the true Church of England *by the name of Non-conformity and Schiſm, and to deceive the ſimple by a noiſe againſt the refuſers of Epiſcopacy, Liturgy, and Ceremonies; but that noiſe ſhall no more divert me from oppoſing the Foundations of Popery.* And I mightily commend the prudence of Mr. *Baxter*'s Reſolution; for it is an eaſier matter to pull down a man of Clouts of his own ſetting up, then to uphold ſuch a decayed and ruinous Cauſe

Cap. 1. Anſwer to Dr. *Sherlock.* p. 230.

But I am reſolved not to loſe the Cauſe thus, and therefore ſhall beat a little backward, till we find it again, and ſhall 1. mind my Readers of the occaſion of that Diſcourſe of Church-Unity and Communion. 2. Give a brief Account of the Doctrine of the defence in thoſe Points, and conſider their Cavils and Exceptions againſt it, and thoſe perverſe ſenſes they put upon my words, to form them into a *Caſſandrian* deſign.

§. 1. I ſhall mind my Readers of the occaſion of that Diſcourſe concerning

Cap. 1. Church-Unity and Communion, whereby they may the better judge of the Nature and Tendency of it. Now there were two things I apparently designed in it. 1. To shew how vain all those projects were of uniting Churches without curing their Separation, such as Mr. *Humphrey*'s is, of making all separate Churches parts of the National Church, by vertue of an Act of Parliament, under the King, as the Accidental Head of such an Accidental Church: For if the Church must be but one, and the Unity of this one Church consists in one Communion, it is impossible in the nature of the thing, for all the power in the World, to make so many separate Churches one Church. The supreme Power may grant equal Liberties and Priviledges in the Common-wealth to all these separate Churches, but it can no more make them one, than it can make Contradictions to be true, the sin and evil of Separation still remains, the removal of which is the only thing that makes Union so desirable; and if an Act of Parliament could do this, I confess the Proposal would be considerable. If the evil and sinfulness of Separation consisted only in disobedience to humane Laws, I should think it

a

a barbarous thing to make any Laws, which ſhall enſnare men in ſo great a guilt: And it is impoſſible in ſuch an Age as this, which is diſtracted with ſo many different and contrary Perſwaſions, to make any Laws about Religion, which will meet with an univerſal compliance. But if the evil of Separation conſiſts in dividing the unity of the Church, which no Laws can cure, but thoſe which cure Separation, Mr. *Humphrey*'s uniting Law can give no eaſe and ſecurity to the Souls and Conſciences of men, whatever it may do to their Liberties and Eſtates: And I take the Souls of men to be of greater concernement, than their Bodies and Eſtates, and therefore ſhould challenge the principal regard from conſcientious men in their Projects of Union. Cap. 1.

2. Another deſign of that Diſcourſe of Church-Unity and Communion, was to give us the moſt plain and eaſie Notion of Schiſm and Separation, which Mr. *B.* and ſome other late Writers have induſtriouſly endeavoured to confound, that no body might know what it is. Now if there be but one Catholick Church all the World over, then every Separation is a Schiſm on one

Cap. 1. ſide or other; for where there are two ſeparate Churches, one, if not both, muſt be ſchiſmatical, becauſe there is but one Church: And if the Unity of this Church conſiſts in one Communion, which exacts a joynt diſcharge of all the Duties of a Church-relation, in hearing, and praying, and receiving the Lord's Supper, *&c.* together, then to forſake the Church, and meet in private Conventicles, in diſtinct and oppoſite Communions for Religious Worſhip, is Separation; and when it is cauſeleſs, is a Schiſm, as I particularly proved in the defence from St. *Cyprian*, and St. *Auguſtin*; this was the ancient Notion of Schiſm. But if there be more than one Church and one Communion; if the Catholick Church conſiſt of all the ſeparate Churches all the World over, as Mr. *Baxter* aſſerts, I would gladly know what Schiſm and Separation is, which hath ſo ill a Character in Scripture, and which the ancient Fathers ſo vehemently declaim againſt, as one of the greateſt Impieties, ſuch a wickedneſs as Martyrdom it ſelf cannot expiate.

Defence. p. 240.

Anſwer to Dr. *Sherlock*. p. 192.

For if there be not one Church, but a great many Churches of diſtinct and ſeparate Communions, thoſe Chriſtians, who

who forſake one Church, and form themſelves into a new Church-ſociety, cannot be ſaid to divide the Church, but to multiply it, they become a diſtinct Church by themſelves; and if they retain all the Eſſentials of Chriſtian Faith and Worſhip, are as good and ſound a part of the Catholick Church, as that particular Church is, from which they ſeparate: For when there is no obligation upon Chriſtians to live in one Communion, what ſhould hinder them, if they pleaſe, from dividing into many? Cap. 1.

If there be more Churches and Communions than one, he who forſakes one Church, and joyns in Communion with another, cannot be ſaid to go, or to be out of the Church, but only to remove from one Church to another; and yet this was the ancient Character of a Schiſmatick, that he was *Extra Eccleſiam foris*, *one who is out of the Church without doors*, and is ſaid, *de eccleſia recedere*, *to go out of the Church*. But according to this Notion, it is impoſſible for a man to go out of the Church, unleſs he forſake the Communion of all the Churches in the World: Nay, if Church-unity does not conſiſt in one Communion, he may do that too, as Mr. *B.* ſays the Seek- *Cypr. de unitate.*

Cap. 1. ers do, and yet while they believe in Chriſt, continue members of the Catholick Church.

Take away the Notion of one Communion, and there are but two things, that I can think of, whereon to found the charge of Schiſm and Separation: Either, 1. on a private Contract and Covenant between the Paſtor and Members of a particular Church; or, 2. on the Authority of the Magiſtrate, who enjoyns us to communicate with ſuch a Church. But now I obſerve firſt, that the Notion of Schiſm was antecedent to both theſe: The ancient Church knew no other Church-covenant but Baptiſm, which obliges us to Catholick Communion, and had no Chriſtian Magiſtrates for three hundred years to enforce or enjoyn any Communion: And yet the Church never had a greater ſence of the evil of Schiſm in any Age, and therefore did believe Schiſm to be a very evil thing, without any regard to private Contracts or humane Authority.

2. To break our Promiſe and Covenant is a great evil, but it is not in its own nature Schiſm, unleſs there be ſomething elſe to make it ſo, beſides breach of promiſe. To diſobey our Governors

vernors in lawful things is a very great evil, but it is not in it ſelf the evil of Schiſm, but of diſobedience to lawful Authority: Theſe do greatly aggravate the ſin of Schiſm, when men are guilty of it, but it cannot make that to be Schiſm which is not; and yet there is no ſuch ſin, and can be no ſuch ſin as Schiſm, if there be not one Church; but men may divide into as many diſtinct and ſeparate Churches, as they pleaſe; for if any man ſhould ſay, that Separation is ſinful, when there is no juſt cauſe or reaſon for Separation, this ſuppoſes that there are neceſſary reaſons againſt Separation, when there are no juſt reaſons for it; and I would gladly hear, what thoſe reaſons are againſt Separation, when you have deſtroyed the Notion of one Catholick Communion. But I have diſcourſed at large the uſe of this Notion of Catholick Communion, in the Diſputes of Schiſm and Separation, in the defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Unreaſonableneſs of Separation, *ch.* 5. *p.* 231. and thither I refer my Reader. Cap. 1.

Now I ſhall hence briefly obſerve two things, with reference to my preſent deſign. 1. That the whole force of my reaſoning againſt Separation in the defence

Cap. 1. fence of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, depends on the Doctrine of one Catholick Communion; and therefore I was not at all concerned to aſſert *one viſible unifying Church-Power under Chriſt*, over all the Catholick Church, as Mr. *B.* calls it. I no where throughout my Book oppoſe Separation, upon the Principles of an univerſal unifying Church-Power, but only on the Principles of Catholick Communion; and therefore neither having any where aſſerted any ſuch thing, nor having any reaſon to do ſo in the ſervice of the Cauſe I undertook, eſpecially having aſſerted the quite contrary, (as in due time will appear) the Reader may eaſily perceive how injuriouſly my Adverſaries have diſtorted my words, to give ſome colour and pretence to their Calumnies.

Anſwer to Dr. *Sherlock*. p. 181.

2. I obſerve farther, That ſuppoſing there had ſome dubious paſſages about an univerſal Church-Power ſlipt from my Pen, the confuting ſuch a fancy as that, is by no means a confutation of the Defence. If the doctrine of one Catholick Communion hold good, as it will certainly do, whatever becomes of Catholick Church-Power, it confounds all their little Excuſes and Apologies for Separa-

Separation, and they are as very Schiſ- Cap. 1.
maticks, as ever the *Novatians* or *Dona-*
tiſts were. Here the Controverſie be-
gan about the ſinfulneſs of Separation;
very angry they were, and gave a great
many hard words to that excellent Per-
ſon, who warned them of the danger
and evil of it; many Books have been
written about it, and now they are
charged as high as ever, and are ferret-
ed out of their Retreats, and ſee the ve-
ry foundations of their Cauſe rooted up;
all on a ſudden they grow tame and
gentle, and patiently hear themſelves
proved Schiſmaticks, without ſaying a
word for themſelves, being more con-
cerned, it ſeems, to oppoſe a French Po-
pery (which ſometimes, by what figure
I know not, they call a *Caſſandrian* de-
ſign) than to vindicate their own dear
ſelves from the charge of Schiſm. Some
poſſibly may think them very mortified
and ſelf-denying men; others will be
tempted to ſuſpect ſome other Cauſe:
But Mr. *B.* is reſolved *that noiſe*
ſhall not divert him from oppoſing the foun-
dations of Popery; the plain meaning
of which is this, He finds it trouble-
ſom to write in a Cauſe, where he is
likely to find ſome pert young Doctors to an-
ſwer

Cap. 1. ſwer him, and therefore is reſolved for the future to diſpute by himſelf, where he is ſecure of the victory, unleſs *Richard* and *Baxter* ſhould happen to quarrel; he having now Printed a Book in Quarto of 230 pages, as a Preparatory to a fuller Treatiſe; I ſuppoſe he means a fourth Folio, he telling us that he has writ three already.

§. 2. I come now to give a plain and brief account of the Doctrine of the Defence concerning *one Catholick Church, and one Catholick Communion*, which my Adverſaries have ſo induſtriouſly miſrepreſented, that it is neceſſary to ſet it in a new Light.

Defence ch. 3. p. 137. *&c.* In the third Chapter I proved at large, that Chriſt has but one Church, which is his Body and Spouſe, which we call the Catholick Church; and I do not find any of my Adverſaries hardy enough to deny the name of one Catholick Church, though it will appear in due time, that they deny the thing.

That the Church is but one, I proved from the expreſs Teſtimony of Scripture, and the ancient Fathers, and by this *Ib.* p. 151. *&c.* unanſwerable Argument, that the Chriſtian Church is not a new Church, but the old *Jewiſh*-Church, reformed and ſpiri-

ſpiritualized by the Laws and Inſtitutions of Chriſt; Chriſtianity being nothing elſe but myſtical Judaiſm. The believing *Jews* continue ſtill united to their own Root, and the believing *Gentiles* are grafted on the *Jewiſh* Root, and become one Church with them, as St. *Paul* diſcourſes. *Rom.* 11. 17, 18, 24. The middle Wall of Partition was broken down, and the *Gentiles* received into the Church of God, which was no longer to be confined within the bounds of *Jury*, nor to the carnal Seed and Poſterity of *Abraham*, but to ſpread it ſelf over all the World; and therefore ſince the Chriſtian Church is not a new Church, but built upon the old foundations of the Jewiſh Church, enlarged and Chriſtianized, it muſt continue as much one, as ever the Jewiſh Church was. Cap. 1.

I obſerved alſo from St. *Cyprian* (whoſe words I had cited at large) "that the Catholick Church, though it conſiſt of all "particular Churches, which are contained in it, yet is not a meer arbitrary Com"bination and Confederacy of particular "Churches, but is the root and fountain "of Unity, and in order of nature ante"cedent to particular Churches, as the "Sun is before its Beams, and the Root "before *Ib.* p. 144.

Cap. 1. "before its Branches, and the Fountain "before the Rivers that flow from it; "that particular Churches are made by "the encreaſe and propagation of the "Catholick Church, not the Catholick "Church by the propagation of particu-"lar Churches.

Here Mr. *Lob* gives us the firſt taſte of his great underſtanding and skill in Controverſie, and what a formidable Adverſary he is like to prove. He ſays, *I aſſert, that the univerſal Church is in order of nature antecedent to particular Churches* (he ſhould have ſaid *Catholick*, for that was my word; but then he had loſt his Metaphyſical ſubtilty about Univerſals, of which more preſently) well, what hurt is there in that aſſertion? why firſt, the Alluſions I uſe for the illuſtration of this, of *the Sun being before its Beams, and the Root before its Branches, and a Fountain before its Rivers, are not* ad rem (that is, not to the purpoſe, nor to the Matter in hand; for I know not what force *Engliſh* Readers may imagine to be concealed in, *ad rem*, unleſs I tranſlate it) but he knew very well, that theſe are not my Alluſions (as he calls them) but St. *Cyprians*', whoſe Authority is much more conſiderable. But ſuppoſe they had

Reply to the Defence. p. 10.

had been my own (as I ſee no Reaſon to be aſhamed of them) what is their fault? why, *I ſhould have given ſome inſtance of ſome one Univerſal, that was in order of nature antecedent to its Particulars.* Now ſuppoſe I think, that the *Sun* and *Root*, and *Fountain*, are ſuch Univerſals, with reſpect to their Beams, Branches, and Rivers; or ſuppoſe there were never an adæquate Example in nature of this, beſides the Catholick Church, what were this, *ad rem*, if it appears, that the Catholick Church be ſuch an Univerſal? Cap. 1.

Yes, if that could be proved indeed, it were ſomewhat to the purpoſe; but that, ſays Mr. *Lob*, *is impoſſible, it being in the ſenſe of moſt evident, that* Univerſale *is* unum in multis, *that is, in many particulars, which Univerſal hath no real Exiſtence but in particulars, but abſtracted from all particulars* 'tis only an Ens Rationis, *having its being in the* Eutopian *Common-wealth; whence we diſtinguiſh between the conſideration of Univerſal, as Formal and as Fundamental. Fundamental and it is,* Quid ſingulare; *but formally, and ſo 'tis abſtracted from all ſingulars, the particulars being the foundation of the Univerſal, the root from which the* *Ibid.*

Cap. 1. *the Univerſal doth proceed. Now if it be the particulars that are the foundation of the Univerſal, how can the Univerſal be the foundation of the particulars?* No way in the World, Sir, *Quod erat demonſtrandum.* This is a very Learned and Scholaſtick Period, and therefore deſerves a juſt regard: And 1. I thank our Author for letting me know, where to find thoſe pretty things called *Ens rationis*, which, it ſeems, have their *Being in the* Eutopian *Common-wealth*, though all Authors are not agreed in this matter; for ſome think it as probable that they have their Being in the *Caſſandrian deſign*, but that makes no great difference; for Learned Geographers ſay, that is the next County to *Eutopia*: But yet it is a material diſcovery Mr. *Lob* hath made, for by this means, we may know where to find the Catholick Church. For, 2. the Catholick Church being an Univerſal, is no better than an *Ens rationis*, a meer Metaphyſical Notion, and therefore muſt have its Being alſo in the *Eutopian* Common-wealth; I wiſh Mr. *Lob* does not at laſt prove the Creed, where we find the Catholick Church, to be a meer *Eutopian* Common-wealth, for giving entertainment to ſuch an *Ens Rationis*. Well, but

but Univerſals have a real exiſtence in particulars! right, but not as Univerſals, but as Particulars; humane nature has a real exiſtence in *Peter*, *James* and *John*, becauſe they are all men; but humane nature conſidered as Univerſal, is in neither of them, unleſs you will make as many Univerſal humane natures, as there are men in the World; thus there are a great many particular Churches actually exiſtent, but the Catholick Church conſidered as Catholick and Univerſal is a meer figment and notion, no where exiſting but in *Eutopia*. And if this be all Mr. *Lob* means by his Univerſal Church, that it is a meer Logical notion, I readily grant, that he has not only proved, that Particular Churches are before the Univerſal Church, but that the Univerſal Church has no actual Being at all, nor can ever have any, and therefore it is a vain thing to diſpute, which of them exiſts firſt, when one of them does not exiſt at all any where but in *Eutopia*. But all this is nothing to me, who never troubled my head about the exiſtence of an *Ens Rationis* in a *Fayry* Land, but aſſert ſuch an Univerſal Church, as has an actual being and exiſtence, which always is or may be viſible in the World, an Univer-

Cap. 1.

Cap. 1. niverſal Church, which is the object of Senſe, not the creature of fancy and imagination.

This I take to be the general ſenſe of all Chriſtians, of what Communion ſoever they are, if they underſtand any thing of theſe matters, that the Univerſal Church is a real thing which does actually exiſt; not as Logical Notions do, but as a Church and Society of Chriſtians: For the Univerſal Church is the Body and the Spouſe of Chriſt, and it is a new fangled Hereſie to aſſert the Body and the Spouſe of Chriſt, to be an *Ens Rationis*; as the Doctr formerly aſſerted his Natural Body, to be only an empty Apparition.

Hitherto particular Churches have been acknowledged to be Members of the Univerſal Church, but no man in his Wits ever dream't before, that a thing which actually exiſts could be a Member of that, which has no real exiſtence, that the Church of *England*, ſuppoſe, or the Church of *France*, ſhould be Members of an imaginary Univerſal Church, which has no Being any where but in *Eutopia*: And therefore to help out our Author here, who has ſo miſerably loſt himſelf in Logick and Metaphyſicks; I obſerve, that

that the Catholick Church, is ſuch an Universal as a whole is, with reſpect to its parts, not as a Species is, with reſpect to the Individuals contained under it; or to ſpeak more plain, as our natural Body is with reſpect to its particular Members, not as humane Nature is, with reſpect to particular men. Cap. 1.

And therefore the moſt common Reaſon aſſigned, both by Ancient and Modern Divines, why the Church is called Catholick and Univerſal, is, not becauſe it is an univerſal Notion, made by a mental Abſtraction from particulars, but becauſe it diffuſes it ſelf all the World over, and propagates it ſelf into all parts, without Diviſion or Multiplication into new diſtinct Churches, but continuing one and the ſame Church from the Beginning, fills the World with Chriſtians, living in this one Communion and Society.

Neceſſario conſequitur, unam duntaxat eſſe Eccleſiam, quam propterea Catholicam nuncupamus, quod ſit Univerſalis, & diffundatur per omnes mundi partes, & ad omnia ſe tempora extendat, nullis vel locis incluſa vel temporibus. Helv. *conf.* cap. 17.

Having thus redeemed the univerſal Church from its inviſible and imaginary State in the *Eutopian* Common-wealth, and brought it back into the World again, let us now conſider how the Church

Cap. 1. becomes Catholick and Univerſal, and which is firſt in order of Nature, the Catholick Church or particular Churches.

Mr. *Lob* asks me, *Where this univerſal Church ſhould be, when Antecedent to any particular Church?* Truly I ſuppoſe it muſt be, where he has placed it, after there are particular Churches, *viz.* in *Eutopia*. But did I ever aſſert that there was a Catholick Church, before there was any one particular Church; that is, before there was any Church at all? Do I not aſſert, *that the univerſal Church in the firſt beginnings of Chriſtianity, was not ſo large as many particular Congregations are now?* And therefore that the Catholick Church did ſubſiſt in a particular Congregation. *That though in the beginnings of Chriſtianity, the true Church of Chriſt was confined to one ſmall Congregation, yet it was the Catholick Church, &c.* If Mr. *Lob* does not underſtand this, I will endeavour to help him in it, if his Conſcience be not more incurable than his Underſtanding. For when I aſſerted, that the Catholick Church is in order of Nature antecedent to particular Churches; I expreſly declared, That I did not conſider the Catholick Church,

Reply, p. 10.

Defence, p. 140.

p. 148.

Def. p. 144.

as

as actually ſpread over all the World, but *as the Root and Fountain of Unity*, As St. *Cyprian* did: For in this Senſe of the word *Catholick* and *Univerſal*, as it ſignifies, the Chriſtian Church diffuſed and propagated in all parts of the World, it is abſurd and ſenſeleſs to affirm, That the Church was Planted in all the World, before it was Planted in any one Country; but I placed the Catholiciſm of the Chriſtian Church, not meerly in its actual Extent, but in its intrinſick Nature; its Extent varies in ſeveral Ages, according to the Progreſs or Decreaſe of Chriſtianity in the World, but the Nature of the Church is always the ſame, be its Extent more or leſs. Cap. 1.

Catholick, indeed is a Name, which we do not find given to the Church in Scripture, nor in the moſt ancient Creeds; but we find in Scripture, that Chriſt has but one Church, and the very Nature and Conſtitution of this Church is ſuch, That it was not to be confined to any one Countrey, as the *Jewiſh* Church was, but to diffuſe and propagate it ſelf all the World over; and upon this Account, as I proved in the Defence, it is called the Catholick Church, becauſe though it be ſpread all the World over, Defence, p. 147.

Cap. 1. it is but one Church ſtill. That very Church, which the Apoſtles firſt planted in *Jeruſalem*, and by degrees enlarged into all parts of the World. The difference between the Church at its firſt Planting, when the beginnings of it were but ſmall, and when it overſpread ſo great a part of the World, is like the difference between a Child new Born, and when he is come to his full Growth and Stature, he is the ſame Perſon ſtill but increaſed in all parts, without dividing one Member from another, or multiplying it ſelf into more Bodies; or like a Grain of Muſtard-Seed, which from ſmall beginnings grows into a large Tree. The Catholick or univerſal Church is that one Church, which is the one Body of Chriſt, which was the ſame Church, when in the beginnings of Chriſtianity, it was confined to a ſingle Congregation at *Jeruſalem*, and when it had ſpread it ſelf over all the World.

Def. p. 146.

Mat. 13. 31, 32.

I would deſire to know, whether Chriſt had ever more than one Church, and one Body? If he had not, Whether that one Church might not always be properly called the Catholick Church? If it might not, Then if Chriſt have a Catholick Church now, and formerly had

had no Catholick Church, he has a Church now which he had not at firſt; and therefore has either changed the Church, which he once had, or has two Churches; one which is not the Catholick Church, and another which is the Catholick Church. Cap. 1.

The Chriſtian Church indeed has ſpread it ſelf into many parts of the World, where it was not at the firſt planting of the Goſpel, and therefore is more Catholick and Univerſal, with reſpect to its extent, than it was at firſt; but the Church, which is now ſpread all the World over, is but that one Church ſtill which began at *Jeruſalem*; and therefore the Church at *Jeruſalem*, while but one ſingle Congregation, was the Catholick Church in its Root, and Fountain, and principle of Unity, which was all that St. *Cyprian*, and I from him, affirmed of this Matter. And if particular Churches now may be Catholick Churches, as maintaining Catholick unity, which was the familiar Language of the primitive Fathers, much more might the firſt Chriſtian Church be very properly called the Catholick Church, as being the Principle and Fountain of Catholick unity.

Particular Churches, as maintaining Catholick Unity, may be call'd Catholick

Cap. 1. But of all things I hate to diſpute about Words, and therefore if Mr. *Lob* will but grant the thing I contend for, let the Words ſhift for themſelves; and that is this, That the Church firſt planted by the Apoſtles in *Jeruſalem*, is that one Church, which was afterwards ſpread over all the World; that when the Apoſtles planted Churches in other Cities, Countries, and Provinces, they did not erect new diſtinct Independent Churches, but only enlarged that one Church of Chriſt, and added new Members to it. Let the Church of Chriſt be acknowledged to be but one, which propagated it ſelf in the Unity of the ſame Body all the World over, and I have no farther Controverſie about this Matter.

This is the only thing I was concerned for, to prove that there is but one Church all the World over; and for this Reaſon, I aſſerted, *That the Catholick Church conſidered as the root and fountain of Unity, was in order of Nature antecedent to particular Churches*: The Catholick Church may ſubſiſt in one particular Church, otherwiſe the belief of the Catholick Church can be no neceſſary Article of our Creed, for the firſt Chriſtian Church, was the particular

Def. p. 144.

ticular Church of *Jeruſalem*, and if that were not in ſome ſenſe the Catholick Church, there was a Chriſtian Church, when there was no Catholick Church, and may be ſo again; if we ſhould ſuppoſe all the World excepting one particular Church, to apoſtatize from the Faith of Chriſt, which yet is generally acknowledged poſſible to be. Cap. 1.

But if particular Churches were in order of Nature antecedent to the Catholick Church, then they muſt be true and compleat Churches, without any regard to Catholick unity, and then it is impoſſible ever after to find or make one Catholick Church. The Notion and Eſſence of the Catholick Church, as far as concerns this Controverſie, conſiſts in ſuch a Catholick unity, as makes all the Chriſtians, and Chriſtian Churches in the World one Body and Church, and Members of each other. Now could we ſuppoſe that there were two or three or more particular Churches before the Catholick Church, as ſuppoſe the Churches of *England*, *France*, and *Spain*, then we muſt acknowledg, that a Church may be a true compleat Church, without any regard to Catholick unity, and then Catholick unity is not neceſſary to the

Cap. 1. the Notion and Being of a Church, and then there can be no neceſſity of one Catholick Church. If it is poſſible, that there ſhould be two Chriſtian Churches, which are not of the ſame Communion, nor Members of each other, then why not a hundred, a thouſand, *&c.* And then there can be no one Catholick Church of Chriſts Inſtitution, whatever there may be by humane Combinations and Confederacies.

The Sum of all is this, Chriſt in the Inſtitution of his Church, deſigned but one Church all the World over, which we call the Catholick Church. This Catholick Church muſt of neceſſity have a beginning ſomewhere, as, *De facto*, it had at *Jeruſalem*; where-ever this beginning is, there is the Root and Fountain of Catholick unity, becauſe all other Chriſtians, and Churches, which afterwards embrace the Chriſtian Faith, are added to this Church, and received into the Unity of this one Body; and it is impoſſible, that any man ſhould be a Chriſtian, or any Society of men a Chriſtian Church, who are not received into the Unity of this Church, not conſidered as ſuch a particular Church, but as the beginning of the Catholick Church;

and

and thus all particular Churches are united to one another, and by vertue of this Catholick union, are one Catholick Church. He who carefully considers this, will see what Reason I had to assert, that the Catholick Church was in order of Nature antecedent to particular Churches; for a Church, which is one by Institution, must begin in one, and enlarge it self by receiving others into the Unity of the same Body, which for the convenience of Worship and Discipline, may form themselves into distinct, but not separate Church-Societies. Cap. 1.

This is an intelligible Account, how all the Churches in the World come to be but one Church, as proceeding from one principle of Unity, from one Root and Stock, and by the necessary Laws of their Constitution incorporated into one Body, and closely united to each other; but those who make particular Churches to be entire and compleat Churches by themselves, in order of Nature and time too, antecedent to the Catholick Church, must either make the Catholick Church an imaginary Being, a meer *Ens Rationis*, as Mr. *Lob* does, or else no better then an arbitrary Combination, which may last as long as they please, and

Cap. 1. and be diſſolved again, when they pleaſe, and yet the particular Churches remain very entire and perfect Churches without it. It is certain, that the Catholick Church cannot be one Church and one Body, if any particular Churches by their eſſential Conſtitution are entire compleat Churches, and not integral parts of the Catholick Church, which they cannot be without ſuch a neceſſary Union as I have now deſcribed.

And to conclude this Argument, I ſhall refer Mr. *Lob* for better Inſtruction in this Matter to Mr. *Baxter*, who, in Anſwer to this Queſtion, *Whether a ſingle Church, or the Catholick Church be first?* Reſolves it thus. *Chriſt was firſt himſelf, and then, Chriſtians as Chriſtians were United to him, and were the Catholick Church in* Fieri, *or an* Embrio: *And then the Paſtor's Office, was made as the Organical Office to make the reſt, ——And when the particular Churches are formed, they are thereby parts of the Univerſal, and as ſuch are,* Simul et Semel, *ſuch Churches and ſuch parts.* Now though Mr. *B.* and I are not like to agree very well in our Notions of the Catholick Church, (a particular Account of which I ſhall give hereafter) yet here are

Anſwer to Dr. *Sherlock*, p. 202.

are ſeveral things for the Inſtruction of Mr. *Lob*, and to vindicate my Notion from ſuch ridiculous Abſurdity, as he charges it with. For, 1. Mr. *B.* acknowledges an univerſal Church, *In fieri or Embrio*, before any particular organized Church, before the Apoſtolical Office it ſelf, which is more than I ſay, who only make the firſt Church, *The Root and Fountain of Catholick unity.* 2. He aſſerts, That *when particular Churches are founded, they are thereby parts of the univerſal Church*; and therefore the univerſal Church muſt be in order of Nature before particular Churches, which is very conſiſtent with their being, *Simul & ſemel*, in order of time. And that he does not look upon the univerſal Church, to be a meer, *Ens Rationis*, *in an* Eutopian *Common-wealth*, but a real exiſtent thing appears from hence, that in the next Paragraph, he owns, *Particular Churches to be integral parts of the Catholick Church.* Cap. 1.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Concerning Catholick Communion.

HAving thus vindicated my Notion of Catholick unity, the next thing in order (for I ſhall confine my ſelf to the Method I obſerved in the Defence, that my Readers may the better know, what the preſent Controverſie is, which my Adverſaries have endeavoured to conceal, as well as miſrepreſent) concerns Catholick Communion.

Defence, p. 159. I aſſerted and proved at large, Ch. 4. *That the Unity of the Catholick Church, conſiſts in one Communion.* I explained what this one Communion is, produced variety of Proofs for it, from the Authority of Scripture, and Ancient Fathers; and none of my Adverſaries yet have had the confidence to attempt any Anſwer to it, either by ſhewing that my Arguments are not cogent, my Authorities from Scripture, or Fathers impertinent or falſe: Mr. *Lob* thinks it ſufficient to ſtart ſome difficult Caſes, and to confront me with the Authority of ſome late

late Writers of the Church of *England*, Cap. 2.
who, as he, who underſtands neither one nor th'other, imagines, contradict what I ſay; which, if it were ſo indeed, is neither a ſufficient Anſwer to me, who prefer the Authority of the Scripture, and Ancient Fathers, before any Modern Doctors, of what Note ſoever; nor a ſufficient juſtification of himſelf and his party, who are condemned by theſe very men, whoſe Authority they oppoſe againſt me, though they do not value it themſelves.

An Argument, *Ad hominem*, can never eſtabliſh a Cauſe, though in ſome caſes it may ſilence an Adverſary; and it is an evident ſign of great prevarication, when men fence only with ſuch Authorities, as they themſelves do not think valid, as it is, a deſperate Cauſe, when they can neither confute the Reaſons which are alledged, nor oppoſe Reaſon to Reaſon; but Mr. *Lob* ſhall have a fair hearing preſently.

Mr. *Baxter* ſeems not to have read this Chapter, which is the main ſeat of the Controverſie, but skips to the 8th. Chapter, where this Doctrine of one Communion is applyed to the Catholick Church, and this is the Reaſon, why he

Cap. 2. he does not underſtand, what I mean by one Communion, but imagines, that I have a Grammar or Dictionary by my ſelf, and will excommunicate them, and make them Schiſmaticks, for ſpeaking as all mankind do. Good man, he is a little miſtaken in this Matter, as uſually he is, and as every man muſt be, who confutes Books before he reads or underſtands them, and replies before he knows what to anſwer.

Anſwer to Dr. *Sherlock*, c. 6. p. 208.

However, let us hear what terrible Objections he has againſt this plain Propoſition, that the Unity of the Catholick Church conſiſts in one Communion. I ſhall tranſcribe his Reaſons, and then give a plain and eaſie Anſwer to them.

1. He ſays, *This is contrary to the common courſe of Nature, in which the Union of all compounded beings maketh them what they are, and goeth before their Operations and Effects. The Union of the Soul and Body goeth before Senſation, Imagination, Intellection, or Volition.*

2. *It is contrary to all Artificial beings in a Clock, a Watch, a Coach,* &c. *The Union of their parts is their relative Form, and goeth before the Exerciſe, and Uſe, and the Effects.*

3. *It*

3. *It is contrary to all Political Beings and Societies: The Union of King and Subjects is the conſtitutive Form of the Kingdom, and goeth before the Adminiſtration or Regiment, by Legiſlation and Judgement, and the Allegiance and Subjection before Obedience. Thus the Union of Husband and Wife, Maſter and Servants, Captain and Souldiers, Schoolmaſter and Scholars, as the Conſtitution of the Relation, go before their Communion in the Exerciſe.* Cap. 2.

4. *If Union and Communion be all one, then a man is new made a Chriſtian at every Act of Communion; for Union is the Conſtitution, and makes us Chriſtians; but the Conſequence is not true.*

5. *If Union and Communion be all one, then Baptiſm doth no more make us Chriſtians, and unite us to Chriſt and his Church, than after-Communion in Prayer and Sacraments do; but this is ſingular and falſe.*

What pity is it, that ſo many good Arguments ſhould be loſt, for want of ſome Thing and ſome Body to oppoſe? for all theſe Arguments proceed upon this Miſtake, That by *Communion*, I mean only ſome tranſient Acts of Chriſtian Communion, ſuch as Praying, and

Cap. 2. Hearing, and Receiving the Lord's Supper together; that the Chriſtian Church is united by ſuch Acts as theſe; whereas theſe Acts of Chriſtian Communion neceſſarily ſuppoſe Chriſtian Union, and therefore can neither be the efficient nor formal Cauſe of it: A man muſt firſt be united to the Church, and one Church to another, before they can communicate together in ſuch Acts of Worſhip, or have any Right to do ſo.

But then I wonder, what he thought I meant by *one Communion*; for if by *Communion*, I meant only a tranſient Act of Communion, by *one Communion*, I could mean but one ſuch tranſient Act. And here he might have found out greater Abſurdities than before, and have triumphed over this ſenſleſs Notion unmercifully; for what a ridiculous conceit is it, to place Chriſtian Unity in ſome one tranſient Act? But poſſibly Mr. *B.* might ſee this Abſurdity, and be merciful to it, for the ſake of his darling Notion of Occaſional Communion, which is juſt ſuch a tranſient Act, and yet, as he thinks, ſufficient to Church Unity, and to juſtifie any man from the Guilt of Schiſm and Separation. But then I cannot but wonder, that he ſhould

ſo

ſo induſtriouſly prove, that the Unity of the Church cannot conſiſt in ſuch tranſient Acts of Communion; for if this be true, (as certainly it is) he may be a Schiſmatick from the Church of *England*, notwithſtanding he ſometimes holds *Occaſional Communion* with her. Cap. 2.

But had Mr. *B.* carefully read and conſidered but the ſix firſt Lines of the 4*th.* Chap. of the *Defence*, where I explain, what I mean by *one Communion*, he might have ſpared all his Arguments, from natural, artificial, and political Unions. My words are theſe; *The* 2*d. thing to be conſidered is, That the Unity of the Chriſtian Church conſiſts in one Communion; Catholick Unity ſignifies Catholick Communion, and one Communion ſignifies one Chriſtian Society, of which all Chriſtians are Members.* From which it is plain, That I did not place this one Communion in any tranſient Acts, but in a fixed and permanent State. And that this is not a new, uncouth way of ſpeaking, but very agreeable to the Language of Scripture and Antiquity, I made appear in the ſame place, and concluded, *This is ſufficient to let you underſtand, what the Ancients meant by Chriſtian Communion, which in a large notion,* Defence. p. 164.

Cap. 2. p. 168. *ſignifies the Chriſtian Church or Society, which is called Communion, from the Communication which all the Members of it had with each other.* So that when I ſay, the Unity of the Catholick Church conſiſts in one Communion, the plain and obvious ſenſe of it is this, That all the Churches of the World are but one Church or one Society, and have the ſame Right, and the ſame Obligation on them, to communicate with each other, as opportunity ſerves, in all thoſe Duties, for the ſake of which Chriſtian Churches are inſtituted, as the Members of a particular Church are. For all particular Churches are as much Members of the univerſal Church, as particular Chriſtians are Members of a particular Church, and therefore are as much bound to communicate with each other: One Communion ſignifies one Body and Society, in which all the Members communicate with one another. As to explain this by a familiar Compariſon: Suppoſe the whole World were one Family, or one Kingdom, in which every particular man, according to his Rank and Station, enjoys equal Priviledges; in this caſe the neceſſity of Affairs would require, that men ſhould live in diſtinct Hou-

Vid. Symſon's Hiſtorical Vindication of Epiſcopacy in Scotland, p. 55, &c.

Houſes, and diſtinct Countreys, as now they do all the World over: But yet if every man enjoyed the ſame Liberty and Priviledges, where-ever he went, as he does now in his own Houſe and Countrey, the whole World would be but one great Family, or univerſal Kingdom. And whoſoever ſhould reſolve to live by himſelf, and not to receive any others into his Family, nor allow them the liberty of his Houſe, would be guilty of making a Schiſm in this great Family of the World; and what Nation ſoever ſhould deny the Rights and Priviledges of natural Subjects, to the Inhabitants of other Countreys, would make a Schiſm, and rent it ſelf from this univerſal Kingdom. Cap. 2.

Thus it is here: The Church of Chriſt is but one Body, one Church, one Houſhold and Family, one Kingdom; and therefore though the neceſſity of Affairs requires, that neighbour-Chriſtians combine themſelves into particular Churches and particular Congregations, as the World is divided into particular Families and Kingdoms, yet every Chriſtian by vertue of his Chriſtianity, hath the ſame Right and Priviledge, and the ſame Obligation to Communion, as occaſi-

Vid. Sherlock's Vind. of some Protest. Principles p. 33. 4to 1688.

Cap. 2. caſion ſerves, with all the Churches of the World, that he has with that particular Church wherein he lives: Whereever he removes his Dwelling, whatever Church he goes to, he is ſtill in the ſame Family, the ſame Kingdom, and the ſame Church.

I can hardly be ſo charitable to Mr. *B.* as not to believe this to be a wilful Miſtake; for it is impoſſible for any man of common ſenſe, who had ever read what I diſcourſed ſo largely and particularly of Catholick Communion, to miſtake it for ſome tranſient Acts of Communion, when I ſo frequently explained one Communion by one Body and Society: And all the Arguments whereby I prove one Catholick Communion, prove only that all Chriſtians and Chriſtian Churches are but one Body, and thereby obliged to all Duties and Offices, and Acts of Chriſtian Communion, which are conſequent upon ſuch a Relation. And this is a ſufficient Anſwer to his three firſt Arguments, from natural, artificial, and political Unions.

But upon a ſtricter Examination of Mr. *B*'s. Arguments, I find he is as much blundered and confounded about the notion of Unity, as he is about Commu-

munion. I aſſerted, that Catholick Unity conſiſts in one Communion; the plain ſenſe of which is no more than this, That the Catholick Church is one, conſidered as one Body and Society, wherein all Chriſtians and Chriſtian Churches have equal Right and Obligation to Chriſtian Communion. This Unity he turns into Union, and underſtands it of our Union to Chriſt, not of the Unity or Oneneſs of the Chriſtian Church, and argues thus: 4. *If Union and Communion be all one, then a man is new made a Chriſtian at every Act of Communion; for Union is the Conſtitution, and makes us Chriſtians.* 5. *If Union and Communion be all one, then Baptiſm doth no more make us Chriſtians, and unite us to Chriſt and his Church, than after-Communion in Prayers and Sacraments do.* Where you ſee he miſconſtrues both the terms; and it would be wonderful to any Logician, to hear him conclude from theſe premiſſes, *Ergo*, the Unity of the Catholick Church does not conſiſt in its being one Body and Society, and Communion of Chriſtians. If this be to write Controverſies, we may e'ne as well lay Wagers, and caſt Lots for *Major*, *Minor*, and *Concluſion*; for any

Cap. 2. Def. p. 164.

Cap. 2. Propoſitions well ſhuffled, will naturally fall into as good Syllogiſms as theſe.

And yet Mr. *B.* had notice given him of this diſtinction between the Union of the Church to Chriſt, and the Unity of all Churches in one Body and Society, in the 8*th.* Chap. of the *Defence*,† where I conſider, *what Communion is eſſential to the Catholick or univerſal Church*; where the Reader may find theſe words, which Mr. *B.* himſelf takes notice of: *I have already proved the Catholick Church to be one viſible Body and Society, and therefore need not now add any thing more to confute that opinion, that the Catholick Church is inviſible, which is aſſerted by* Dr. Owen, *and his* Independent *Brethren. But Mr. B. and others, who acknowledge one viſible Catholick Church, conſiſting of all the particular Churches in the World, do not much differ from Dr. O's. inviſible Church, while they make the Unity of this Church to conſiſt only in their Union to Chriſt, as Head of the Church, not in the Union of Churches, as Members of the ſame Body: For I take it not to be enough, that all Churches are united to Chriſt, unleſs they be all united in one Body; for the whole Church cannot be the one Body of Chriſt, unleſs all particular Church-*

† *Def. p. 593, 4*

Anſwer to Dr. *Sherlock.* p. 208.

Churches are one Body. And therefore I would desire Mr. B. and his Brethren to tell us, how the whole Catholick Church is united into one Body: I assert, this is done by one Communion; if he can tell any better way, I would gladly learn it, especially if he can tell me, how all Churches can be one Body without one Communion. This *sudden Humiliation*, as Mr. *B.* calls it, in being contented *to learn of him*, makes him condescend to undertake this task to teach me, but very much suspects my capacity to learn, till I am better instructed by some *Grammarians, Metaphysical and Political Teachers, what the meaning of Union and Communion is, what is the difference between Essentials, and Integrals, and Accidents, and of Union and Communion in each of these, and how many sorts of Union and Communion there are, that are pertinent to our Case*, &c. I do not wonder, there are so few persons who understand Mr. *B.* or are capable of learning from him, since there are so many things to be understood before-hand, to prepare them for his Instructions, as no man of sense can ever understand. Cap. 2. *Ib.* p. 209.

I ask Mr. *B.* one plain Question, How the whole Catholick Church is united into

Cap. 2. to one Body, ſo as to become one Church? In Anſwer to this, he ſends me to *Grammarians* and *Metaphyſicians*, to learn how many ſorts of Union there are; though I care not how many ſorts of Union there are, if he will tell me, what the Unity of the Catholick Church is. But he ſays, 1. *He cannot talk ſenſe about theſe things, without diſtinguiſhing about the unifying of the Society, and the uniting a ſingle Member to that Society.* But I ſuppoſe in my Queſtion, particular Churches already formed, and particular Chriſtians united to theſe Churches, and only enquire, how all theſe Chriſtians and all theſe Churches are one Church. Other men, I believe, could talk ſenſe, without theſe Diſtinctions, which Mr. *B.* ſeems to be ſo fond of, only to prevent his Readers from underſtanding ſenſe. 2. *He muſt diſtinguiſh alſo an eſſentiating Union, and an integrating or accidental Union and Communion.* I perceive we ſhall never come to the Buſineſs: For I did not enquire, wherein the eſſence of the Church conſiſts, or what degrees of Communion are more or leſs neceſſary to its Being, which I ſuppoſe he means by his eſſentiating, integrating, accidental Union and Com-

Communion; but I ſuppoſe a thouſand Churches, or as many more as you pleaſe, with all the Eſſentials, Integrals, Accidentals of a Church, and enquire how theſe thouſand Churches become one Church. Poſſibly theſe Diſtinctions may be the way of ſpeaking ſenſe, but I perceive they are not the way of ſpeaking to the purpoſe. Cap. 2.

But let us now conſider the Account Mr. *B.* gives us of this Matter: And 1. he ſays, *It is only eſſential to the Church, that there be an organized Body of Paſtors and People united to Chriſt the Head.* Here I agree with Mr. *B.* if he would add *one Body*; for that is the thing in Diſpute, whether Chriſt have one or a thouſand Bodies; if but one, how all the Chriſtians and Churches in the World make up that one Body. 2. He adds, *In this Definition, Chriſt only is the ſupream, conſtitutive*, Summa Poteſtas, *or regent part; the organized Body of Paſtors and People, but the* Pars ſubdita, *and the Union of Chriſt and that Body maketh it a Church.* This is very well ſtill: We acknowledge Chriſt to be the ſupream Governour of his Church, and that the Union of Paſtors and People to Chriſt makes them a Church; but the main

Cap. 2. main Queſtion ſtill remains untouched, What it is, which makes all the Chriſtian Paſtors and People in the World to be but *one Church.*

Nor does his Similitude help him out, which is ſo admirable in its Philoſophy and Application, that I cannot let it paſs. His words are theſe: *As in the Conſtitution of Man,* 1. *The rational Soul is the real Form, which is,* Principium Motus. 2. *The organized Body is the conſtitutive Matter: That there be Heart, Liver, Stomach, is but the Bodies Organization; that theſe parts be duly placed and united, is* Forma Corporis, non Hominis, *and makes the Body but* Materia diſpoſita. 3. *The Union of Soul and Body is that* Nexus, *(like the* Copula *in a Propoſition) which may be called the relative Form, or that which maketh the Soul become* Forma in actu. Had this Philoſophy been known in St. *Paul's* days, I ſhould not much have wondred, that he warns men againſt vain Philoſophy. I ſhall avoid diſputing with Mr. *B.* as much as I can, and therefore ſhall not quarrel with him for ſaying, that the Soul is *Principium Motus*, the Beginning, or firſt Cauſe and Principle of Motion to the Body, though it may be ſome

ſome *Carteſians* will not like it: Nor for affirming, that the Union of Soul and Body, is but like the *Copula* in a Propoſition, which is a ſpick and ſpang new Notion; but ſhall only conſider, how he applies this to the Church. Chriſt it ſeems then is the Soul, and Chriſtians the Body; though in Scripture he is repreſented as the Head of the Body, and the divine Spirit as the Soul which enlivens and animates it: And if Chriſt be not the Head of the Body, (which I think the Soul was never accounted yet) the Church muſt be without a Head, or have ſome other Head than Chriſt, which I ſuppoſe is the Reaſon, why he talks ſo much of a conſtitutive Regent Head of the Church. But *the organized Body is the conſtitutive Matter* of the man, though other Philoſophers uſed to call the Body a conſtitutive part; but to let that paſs. Thus an organical Church is *the conſtitutive Matter*; of what? Of Chriſt, or of his Church, or of ſome third thing compounded of both? *That there be Heart, Liver, Stomach, is but the Bodies Organization*; this is eaſily applied. Thus Apoſtles, Prophets, Paſtors and Teachers, and People, make an organical Church; but *that theſe parts* Cap. 2.

be

Cap. 2. *be duly placed and united, is* Forma Corporis, non Hominis, is the Form of the Body, not of the Man; which what it means, I cannot tell, unleſs that a man would be a man, though the ſeveral parts of his Body did not ſtand in their right places, nor were united to one another; ſo they were all united to the Soul. And thus the Catholick Church is one Body, by being united to Chriſt, though the parts of it are not united to each other; and much ſuch a Body it is, as the natural Body would be, did the Legs and Arms grow out of the Head, and every Member change places without any order, or divide from each other, and hang together only by a Magical kind of Union with the Soul. Well, but this Organization and due Poſition of the Parts, makes the Body, *Materia diſpoſita*, Matter fitly diſpoſed; I ſuppoſe he means, for Union with the Soul: But is this diſpoſition of the Matter ſo neceſſary, that a Soul cannot unite with a Body otherwiſe diſpoſed, without forfeiting the external Form of a Man, his Senſes, or his Underſtanding? And conſequently, that no reaſonable Soul, which is not under ſome force, would unite with ſuch a Body. If this be his mean-

meaning, it fits our preſent Caſe very well; for then the Church cannot be united to Chriſt in one Body, without union with it ſelf; and the Unity of the Catholick Church cannot conſiſt meerly in the union of all particular Churches in and to Chriſt, without any union among themſelves. But how to apply the *Copula* in a Propoſition, either to the union of Soul or Body, or of Chriſt and his Church, I cannot tell, and ſhall never be able to learn, till I meet with ſome new *Baxterian* Logick, as well as Grammar and Metaphyſicks. But to proceed, as a farther Explication of this Matter, he adds, Cap. 2.

3. *In this Union there is no* Summa Poteſtas, *or univerſal Governour, (Monarchical or Ariſtocratical) but Chriſt.* In this we agree alſo, as will appear more hereafter.

And now or never to the Point: 4. *The Body is ſufficiently organized, if it conſiſts of local Churches, called ſingle or particular, being Paſtors and Chriſtian People, (having all the Eſſentials of Chriſtianity.)* But is our Diſpute then about the Organization, or about the Unity of the Body? The Catholick Church has no other Organization, but that of par-

Cap. 2. particular Churches; but there is ſomething more required to make it one: No, ſays Mr. *B. that which maketh this Body* (that is, all the Chriſtians and Chriſtian Churches in the World) *to become a Church*, (he ſhould have ſaid, *one Church*) *is no union of the Members among themſelves*: So that the Catholick Church may be one Body, without the union of its Members among themſelves, *i. e.* it may be one without Unity. But why ſhould not union of the Members among themſelves be neceſſary to make a Church one? Becauſe, ſays Mr. *B. that maketh them only* Materia diſpoſita, *i. e.* Matter diſpoſed, prepared, fitted; but for what? To be one Church? I ſhould rather think, that the union of ſeveral Churches makes them one Church, and does not only prepare and diſpoſe them to be one, unleſs he can tell, how they can be more one than by Unity. But however, are any other Churches, which have no union among themſelves, this *Materia diſpoſita*, or Matter diſpoſed and fitted to make one Catholick Church? If they be, then there is no need of any Union, ſo much as to diſpoſe and prepare the Matter: If they be not, then I ſtill enquire, what

that

that Union of Churches is, which is ne- Cap. 2.
ceſſary to make them fit matter for the
Catholick Church? But this Mr. *B.* has not yet vouchſafed to tell me; though poſſibly this may be one of thoſe things, which I muſt learn from ſome Grammarians or Metaphyſicians, before I can be capable of his Inſtructions.

But Mr. *B.* tells us, how the Church is one without any Union of the Members among themſelves, *viz. by their common Union with Chriſt, and then all ſingle Perſons and Churches are one Catholick Church, becauſe united in and to him, as all Lines are united in the Center.* So that there is no neceſſity of any other Union between ſeveral Churches to make them one Catholick Church, but that they are all united to Chriſt the common Center; they are one Church, though as diſtant and oppoſite to each other, as the two Poles, becauſe they meet in the ſame Center.

But 1. This is a pretty eaſie way of determining Controverſies to out-face all the Authority of Scripture and Antiquity, by a dogmatical Aſſertion, without offering the leaſt Reaſon or ſhadow of Reaſon to confirm it: I had at large proved the neceſſity of one Catholick

Cap. 2. Communion to make one Catholick Church, and inſtead of anſwering theſe Proofs, he aſſerts the contrary, upon his own naked Authority, and that muſt paſs for a Confutation.

And 2. He takes that for granted, which I can never grant him, that thoſe Churches which are divided from each other, by ſeparate and oppoſite Communions, may yet be all united to Chriſt; for Chriſt has but one Body, one Spouſe, one Flock, one Church, and if we be not Members of this one Church, (as no Schiſmaticks are) we are not united to Chriſt: and therefore it is a vain thing to talk of uniting thoſe in Chriſt, who are not united among themſelves; for Chriſt hath not an hundred ſeveral Bodies, but one Body, and we muſt continue in the Unity of this Body, if we will enjoy Union and Communion with Chriſt.

3. When he places the Unity of the Catholick Church, in the Union of all ſingle Perſons and Churches in and to Chriſt, he muſt either mean this of an external and viſible Union to Chriſt, by an external and viſible profeſſion of Faith in him, or a real, internal, myſtical Union.

1. If

1. If he mean the Firſt, an external and viſible Union to Chriſt, I obſerve, that this can neither be made, nor be known, but by ſomething, which is external and viſible. We cannot know, that any Society of men is the Church of Chriſt, but by their external profeſſion of Faith in him, and ſubjection to him; nor can we know, that a hundred Societies are the ſame Church, but by ſome common Profeſſion and Practiſe; and if, by the Inſtitution of our Saviour, one Communion be eſſential to the Notion of one Church, as I have abundantly proved it is, then the viſible Union of all Churches, in and to Chriſt, conſiſts in their viſible Communion with each other. Cap. 2.

2. If he mean a myſtical internal Union, I have two things to ſay to him. 1. This makes the Catholick Church inviſible; for if the Unity of the Catholick Church conſiſts only in the Union of all Churches in Chriſt, and this Union be a myſtical inviſible Union, then the Catholick Church it ſelf muſt be inviſible too. 2. Though particular Chriſtians may be thus myſtically united to Chriſt, yet no particular Churches are thus united to Chriſt much

Cap. 2. leſs all the particular Churches in the World, unleſs you will ſay, that none belong to the Church, but thoſe Perſons who are true and ſincere Chriſtians, which reduces the Church to the inviſible number of the Elect, and deſtroyes not only the Viſibility, but in many caſes the Organization of the Church on Earth, for I fear the Paſtors and Governours of the viſible Church, are not alwayes inviſibly united to Chriſt, and therefore according to this way of arguing, it is not viſible, whether Chriſt have an organical Church on Earth: which ſhows how abſurd it is, to place the Unity of the Catholick Church, in this inviſible Union of particular Churches to Chriſt.

I may add 3. That no men are thus inviſibly united to Chriſt, who are not viſible Members of the Catholick Church, and do not live in viſible Communion with it, when it may be had; for otherwiſe we deſtroy the neceſſity of a viſible Church, or of a viſible Profeſſion, and Practiſe of Chriſtian Communion, even in particular Churches: Which ſhows, that the Notion of Catholick Unity, and a Catholick Church, does not conſiſt in ſuch an inviſible Union

to

to Chriſt, for our inviſible Union to Chriſt, neceſſarily ſuppoſes our viſible Communion with his Church; and ſince Chriſt hath but one Church, it requires our viſible Communion with the Catholick Church; and this ſuppoſes that there is a viſible Catholick Church, of a diſtinct Conſideration from the inviſible Church of the Elect, which therefore cannot be founded on an inviſible Union to Chriſt, but on ſomething which is viſible, ſuch an external Profeſſion, and external Communion, as may be ſeen. The ſum is this, No Church can be the Church of Chriſt, but upon account of ſome Union to him, either viſible, or inviſible, or both; but that which makes all the Churches of the World, the one Church and Body of Chriſt, muſt be an Union amongſt themſelves, which I have proved, conſiſts in one Catholick Communion. What Mr. *B.* farther adds, proceeding upon the ſame Miſtake, needs no particular Anſwer; and what deſerves any farther Examination, will fall in under another Head. Cap. 2.

But Mr. *Lob* (I confeſs) has pinched harder in this Cauſe, having alleadged ſome venerable Names in the Church of

Cap. 2. *England* againſt me, Arch-biſhop *Bramhall*, Mr. *Hooker*, Dr. *Field*, all very great men, to whoſe Memories I cannot but pay a juſt Reverence and Reſpect: But yet if it ſhould appear, that my Notion of Catholick Communion ſhould differ from theirs (as I think it does in ſome Points from Arch-biſhop *Bramhal's*) while I have the Authority of Scripture, and the primitive Church, I think my ſelf very ſafe, notwithſtanding the diſſent of any modern Doctors, of what note ſoever. Only hence we may learn, with what Judgment and Honeſty Mr. *Lob* charges me with carrying on the *Caſſandrian* Deſign, when I differ from the Arch-biſhop in thoſe very Points, for which he was (though very unjuſtly) charged with it.

But let us examine Particulars. I aſſert, that all Chriſtians and Chriſtian Churches in the World are one Body, Society, or Church; and this is called Catholick Communion, becauſe it obliges them all to communicate in all the external Offices and Duties of Religion and Church-Society, and Memberſhip, as occaſion offers, eſpecially neighbour-Chriſtians are bound to live together in external Communion with that Church

in

in which they are; and that whoever cauſeleſly ſeparates from any Church, which lives in Catholick Communion, is a Schiſmatick from the Catholick Church. Cap. 2.

Mr. *Lob*, to avoid this, alledges the Authority of Arch-biſhop *Bramhal*, and triumphs over me after his uſual rate, for not having con'd my Leſſon well, nor ſufficiently digeſted my Notions, which he ſuppoſes I learnt (though very imperfectly) from this great Maſter: he tells me, *This great Prelate uſes ſeveral diſtinctions about Communion, which would have been for my purpoſe and rectification*: Though whoever reads my Book, will find, that I was not ignorant of theſe Diſtinctions, but did not think them to my purpoſe. Reply to the Defence, p. 14

The Biſhop ſayes, *The Communion of the Chriſtian Catholick Church, is partly internal, partly external*: And do I any where deny this? The Queſtion only is, whether internal Communion will excuſe men from the guilt of Schiſm, who ſeparate from the external Communion of the Church, when it may be had without ſin? And this I deny, and do not ſee, where the Biſhop aſſerts the contrary. *Bramhal's* Vindication of the Church of *England*. Tom. 2. Diſc. 2. P. 57.

Cap. 2. But let us hear, what *internal Communion* is, which he ſayes, *conſiſts principally in theſe things. To believe the ſame entire ſubſtance of ſaving neceſſary Truth revealed by the Apoſtles, and to be ready implicitely in the Preparation of the mind, to imbrace all other ſupernatural Verities, when they ſhall be ſufficiently propoſed to them: to judge charitably of one another.* And do not I alſo expreſly ſay, that *the ſame Faith, and mutual Love and Charity, are the Bonds and Ligaments of Chriſtian Union?* *That the Unity of Faith muſt be acknowledged, as abſolutely neceſſary to the Unity of Chriſtians, for Hereticks are no Members of the Chriſtian Church?*

Defence, p. 171.

p. 172.

But we muſt *exclude none from the Catholick Communion and hope of Salvation, either Eaſtern, or Weſtern, or Southern, or Northern Chriſtians, which profeſs the ancient Faith of the Apoſtles and primitive Fathers, eſtabliſhed in the firſt general Councils, and comprehended in the Apoſtolick*, Nicene *and* Athanaſian *Creeds*: Here Mr. *Lob* makes a Query, *Whether, ſeeing the Faith contained in theſe Creeds, is profeſſed by the Diſſenters, this Gentleman doth not fall ſhort in this reſpect of Catholick internal Communion,*

by

by excluding the Diſſenters from the Catholick Communion, and hope of Salvation. But our Queſtioniſt ſhould have conſidered, that to *exclude from Catholick Communion*, is an ambiguous Phraſe, and may ſignifie two very different things. 1. Not to receive thoſe into our Communion, who are willing and deſirous to communicate with us; and thus no man, that I know of, but themſelves, exclude Diſſenters from Catholick Communion, and thereby, from the ordinary means of Salvation, which is to be had only in the Unity of the Church. Or 2. It may ſignifie not owning thoſe for the Members of the Catholick Church, who divide themſelves from the external and viſible Communion of it, while they profeſs the ſame Catholick Faith. If the Biſhop meant this, by excluding from Catholick Communion, all that I ſhall ſay to it, is this, that he muſt condemn St. *Cyprian*, *Cornelius*, and all the *Italian* and *African* Biſhops in their dayes, and St. *Auſtin*, *Optatus*, and the Catholick Church in their time, for excluding the *Novatians* and *Donatiſts* from Catholick Communion, and the hope of Salvation, not for any Error or Hereſie in Faith, but for a Cap. 2.

Schiſ-

Cap. 2. Schiſmatical Separation from the Catholick Church; and I am contented to be a Schiſmatick in ſo good Company, as the Catholick Church in St. *Cyprian's* and St. *Auſtin's* dayes. But I have proved at large in the Defence, that the ſame Faith is not ſufficient to make any men Catholick Chriſtians, who ſeparate from the external Communion of the Catholick Church; but this our Author did not think fit to meddle with.

P. 171, &c.

Mr. *Lob* proceeds, *Moreover as to external Communion*, ſayes *Bramhal*, *there are degrees of Excluſion*, and did I ever deny this? Do I make all the Cenſures of the Church equal? *But it may be waved or withdrawn by particular Churches or Perſons, from their neighbour Churches and Chriſtians in their Innovations and Errors*, moſt certain! If they be ſuch Innovations and Errors, as make their Communion ſinful; but every Innovation, nor every Error, which does not corrupt their Religious Worſhip, is no juſt cauſe for a Separation, or for waving or withdrawing Communion. But of this more hereafter.

He adds from Biſhop *Bramhal*, *Nor is there ſo ſtrict and perpetual adherence required to a particular Church, as there*

is

is to the univerſal Church: But how I am concern'd in this, I cannot ſee; for by *adherence to the univerſal Church*, the Biſhop ſeems to mean, adhering to the Judgment or Decrees of the univerſal Church aſſembled in a general Council, which he makes the ſupream Authority of the Church on Earth, and therefore prefers their Decrees before the Decrees or Canons of any particular Church; and I agree with him ſo far, that the Judgment of a general Council, if ſuch a Council could be had, is to be preferred before the Decrees of any particular Church, and ought not, without ſome neceſſary and apparent Reaſons, be ſlighted or diſobeyed by particular Chriſtians or Churches; though I do not make a general Council, the conſtitutive regent Head of the Catholick Church; but if by *adherence* Mr. *Lob* will underſtand *Communion*, I do aſſert, that Communion with a particular Church, which is it ſelf in Catholick Communion, is as neceſſary as Communion with the Catholick Church, and he that ſeparates from any ſuch Church, ſeparates and divides himſelf from the Catholick Church; and this I ſhall believe, till I ſee better Reaſon for the contrary. Cap. 2.

Let

Cap. 2. Let us now consider how he urges me with the Authority of Mr. *Hooker* and Dr. *Field*. I assert that the Unity of the Catholick Church consists in one Communion, and consequently that those Christians and Churches which do not live in Catholick Communion, are no Members of the Catholick Church, but are out of the Church, *extra Ecclesiam foris*, according to the Language of the primitive Fathers. Whereas I acknowledge, he has proved by very plain Testimonies from Mr. *Hooker* and Dr. *Field*, that they own all those for Christians and Members of the visible Church, who profess the Faith of Christians, and are baptized, though they be Schismaticks, Hereticks, Idolaters, excommunicable or excommunicated Persons; and therefore either Christ must have more Churches than one, which I deny, or the Unity of the Catholick Church cannot consist in one Communion, as I assert; for Schismaticks, Hereticks, Idolaters, are not in the same Communion, and yet are all Members of the visible Church. I own his Citations out of Mr. *Hooker* and Dr. *Field*, and therefore need not repeat them, and have represented the Objection with great-

greater Advantage and Perſpicuity, than he has himſelf; for I neither deſign to cheat my ſelf, nor to impoſe upon my Readers, nor to perpetuate Controverſies, as my Adverſaries do, by falſe Repreſentations of Things, or ſome ſhuffling and ſophiſtical Arts to put by a Blow. Cap. 2.

But all this appearing Difference is not real but verbal: Mr. *Hooker* and Dr. *Field* believe Schiſmaticks and Hereticks to be as much out of the Church, as I do; and I believe them to be as much in the Church, as they do.

When Mr. *Hooker* aſſerts, That all that profeſs the Faith of Chriſt, whatever they be, whether Schiſmaticks, Hereticks, Idolaters, are Members of the viſible Church of Chriſt, he underſtands the viſible Church in a large Notion, to comprehend the whole Body of profeſs'd Chriſtians. And therefore the Reaſon he aſſigns for it is, becauſe all Mankind are Chriſtians or Infidels: Thoſe who believe in Chriſt, what-ever their other Errors in Doctrine, or Miſcarriages in Life and Practice may be, are Chriſtians in ſome ſenſe notwithſtanding, and therefore viſible Members of the Chriſtian Church, as that comprehends all Chri-

Cap. 2. Chriſtians; but thoſe who do not believe in Chriſt, are Infidels. Now I acknowledge, as much as Mr. *Hooker* can do, that there is a difference between a profeſt Chriſtian, though a Schiſmatick, Heretick, Idolater, or excommunicated, and an Infidel. Such Perſons, who have been once incorporated into the Church by Baptiſm, whatever they prove after, may be reſtored to the Church again, without being rebaptized; but an Infidel cannot be admitted without Baptiſm, which is a plain proof, that the firſt do in ſome ſenſe belong to the Body of Chriſt, and that the other do not. Baptized Chriſtians, though Schiſmaticks, Hereticks, Idolaters, ſhall at the laſt day be judged not as Infidels, but as wicked and apoſtate Chriſtians; when men are made the Members of Chriſt's Body by Baptiſm, and an external profeſſion of Chriſtianity, they can never alter this Character, but ſhall be finally judged, either condemned or rewarded as Chriſtians, and upon this account may ſtill be ſaid to belong to the Church of Chriſt.

Dr. *Field*, whoſe Authority Mr. *Lob* alledges againſt me, has plainly reconciled this appearing difference, as every ordinary

ordinary Reader would have ſeen, had our Author been ſo honeſt, as to have tranſcribed the whole Paragraph; and therefore ſince he has only cited a part of it, I will tranſcribe the whole: His words are theſe: *This is the firſt ſort of them, that depart and go out from the Church of God, and Company of his People, (viz.* Schiſmaticks) *whoſe departure yet is not ſuch, but that notwithſtanding their Schiſm, they are and remain parts of the Church of God; for whereas in the Church of God, is found an entire profeſſion of the ſaving Truth of God, Order of holy Miniſtry, Sacraments by vertue thereof adminiſtred, and a bleſſed Unity and Fellowſhip of the People of God, knit together in the bond of Peace, under the command of lawful Paſtors and Guides, ſet over them to direct them in the wayes of eternal Happineſs: Schiſmaticks notwithſtanding their Separation, remain ſtill conjoyned with the reſt of God's People, in reſpect of the Profeſſion of the whole ſaving Truth of God, all outward acts of Religion and Divine Worſhip, power of Order and holy Sacraments, which they by vertue thereof adminiſter, and ſo ſtill are and remain parts of the Church of God: But as their Communion and*

Cap. 2.

Dr. *Field*, of the Church, 1. B. Ch. 13

69

Cap. 2. *and Conjunction with the reſt of God's People, is in ſome things only and not abſolutely in all, wherein they have and ought to have Fellowſhip, ſo are they not fully and abſolutely of the Church, nor of that more ſpecial number of them, that communicate intirely and abſolutely in all things neceſſary, in which ſenſe they are rightly denied to be of the Church; which I take to be their meaning, that ſay they are not of the Church.*

So that Dr. *Field* expreſly acknowledges, that Schiſmaticks may be rightly denied to be of the Church, though they continuing Chriſtians by external profeſſion of Faith in Chriſt, may in a looſe and large ſenſe of the Word, be ſaid to belong to the Chriſtian Church, as they retain ſomething which belongs to the Church ſtill among them.

But to make this more plain and eaſie, I ſhall briefly diſtinguiſh between the ſeveral Notions and Acceptations of a Church. For 1. the Church ſometimes ſignifies the number of the Elect, that is, all ſincere Chriſtians, who are vitally united to Chriſt by a true and lively Faith, a divine Love and Charity, and all other Chriſtian Graces and Vertues, who are living and fruitful Branches in this

this ſpiritual Vine. And this Church is commonly called the myſtical Body of Chriſt, by reaſon of that myſterious union which is between Chriſt and good men, and the inviſible Church, becauſe we, who cannot know the Hearts of men, cannot certainly know who belongs to this Church. Cap. 2.

2. There is the viſible Catholick Church, which conſiſts of all thoſe Chriſtians and Churches, who profeſs the true Faith of Chriſt, obſerve his Laws and Inſtitutions, and live in Communion and Fellowſhip with each other. This Church is called viſible, from its viſible profeſſion of the Chriſtian Faith, and external and viſible Communion; and Catholick, becauſe all ſuch Churches all the World over, are but one Communion. This is that Church which is the viſible Body and Spouſe of Chriſt, to the Communion of which, all the ordinary means of Salvation are annexed and confined. Now it is commonly and truly obſerved, that there are ſome profeſſed Chriſtians, who are only in this Church, others who are of it, and others who are out of it. Thoſe who are in the Church, but not true Members of it, are thoſe profeſſed Chriſtians, who live in the

Cap. 2. Communion of the Church, but yet are either ſecret Hypocrites, or openly wicked, but not excommunicated; theſe are in the Church by external Profeſſion, as dead and withered Branches are in the Vine, till they be cut off. All ſincere good Chriſtians are both in the Church and of it; they are in the Church by an external and viſible Profeſſion, and an external Communion, which is abſolutely required of all Chriſtians, when it may be had; and they are of the Church, that is, true and lively Members of it, by a ſincere Faith and Obedience to Chriſt. None properly belong to the viſible Church, but thoſe whom we call the inviſible Church, that is, all ſincere Chriſtians; for the viſible and inviſible are not two, but one Church. And the Reaſon of the diſtinction between them is, becauſe the Government of the Church being committed to men, who cannot diſcern Hearts and Thoughts, and the neceſſity of external Affairs, or the negligence of Church-Governours, looſening the Reins of Diſcipline, many bad men continue in the viſible Communion of the Church, either becauſe they are not known, or becauſe when known, they are not through

through the Neglect of Church-Officers, Cap. 2.
or cannot through the Iniquity of the
Times, be caſt out. And therefore the viſible Church in Scripture is called the Body, the Spouſe of Chriſt, the Wife of the Lamb, a royal Prieſthood, a holy Nation, a peculiar People, pure, undefiled, holy; and by ſuch like Characters of peculiar Sanctity, with reſpect to what the Church is in its original Inſtitution, and what it actually is in its true and ſincere Members, not regarding what ſome viſible Profeſſors are, who are in the Church indeed, but are not of it, and ought not to be in it. The not obſerving of which, has occaſioned many Divines to aſcribe all ſuch Titles and Characters, not to the viſible, but to the myſtical and inviſible Church, which in many Caſes is the Reaſon of ſome conſiderable Miſtakes.

But then all Hereticks, and Schiſmaticks, and excommunicated Perſons, are out of this Church, till they either return, or be reſtored to the Communion of it. For to be in the Church, is nothing elſe but to live in the Communion of it, and to have a Right to actual Communion in ſome or all Chriſtian Offices: And therefore thoſe, who either by their

Cap. 2. own Choice, or by the Cenſures of the Church, are not in Communion, muſt be out of it. And nothing is more common in all Church-Writers, both ancient and modern, than to meet with ſuch Expreſſions as theſe; of ſeparating from the Church, going out of it, being out, and being caſt out of the Church; which is a very ſtrange way of ſpeaking, if Mr. *Lob*'s Notion be true, That all profeſſed Chriſtians, what-ever they are, are Members of the Catholick Church; for then it is impoſſible for a profeſſed Chriſtian, either to go out, or to be caſt out of the Catholick Church, as it is for a man to go out of the World.

This is that one Catholick Church, and Catholick Communion, which I aſſerted and proved in the *Defence*, from whence Hereticks and Schiſmaticks depart and go out, and the Excommunicate are caſt out.

But now the Difficulty is, Whither theſe Hereticks and Schiſmaticks go, when they go out of the Church. They cannot go into the World of Infidels and Unbelievers, for Hereſie and Schiſm does not make men Infidels; and if they be neither in the Church nor in the World, what third State ſhall we find for them? The

The plain Reſolution of which in Cap. 2.
ſhort is this, That they are the Conventicles of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, which is a kind of middle State between the true Catholick Church, and the World of Infidels.

They have not wholly renounced Chriſtianity, and therefore in ſome ſenſe belong to the Chriſtian Church, though they are not in it. There ſeems to be the ſame difference between Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, and Catholick Chriſtians, as there is between Rebels and dutiful Subjects: They are both natural Subjects to their Prince, as being born in his Territories, and under the ſame Oaths of Allegiance; Rebels are not Aliens and Foreigners, but Subjects ſtill. Thus Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, though they have corrupted the Chriſtian Faith, and divided the Church, yet they have the Character of Chriſtian Baptiſm, and either retain the Chriſtian Faith entire, or ſo much of it as will denominate them Chriſtians: They may have the Power of Orders, Officers rightly conſtituted, Chriſtian Sacraments, and all the Eſſentials of a true Church, excepting Chriſtian Peace and Unity, and Catholick Communion. This was the Caſe of the *Donatiſt*

385

inf. 119.

63

Cap. 2. *natiſt* Churches, which were in all things like the Catholick Churches, excepting Catholick Communion.

Upon this ſcore many learned men own corrupt Churches, which retain the Eſſentials of the Chriſtian Faith, though mixed and blended with many Errors, and ſchiſmatical Churches, which retain the Purity of Faith and Worſhip, to be true, though not every way ſound and orthodox, nor Catholick Churches: Which I hope will ſatisfie Mr. *Lob*, how the Church of *Rome* may be acknowledged to be a true Church, and yet both corrupt and ſchiſmatical.

+ by true meaning real, tho' not true meaning ſound

There is one Diſtinction, which is not ſo commonly obſerved, which will make all this Diſpute plain and eaſie: And that is, between the viſible Church, and the one true Catholick viſible Church. The viſible Church comprehends all Societies of profeſſed Chriſtians whatſoever, Hereticks, Schiſmaticks, Idolaters, or whatever they be; the one viſible Catholick Church contains only thoſe Churches, which are found in the Faith, and live in Catholick Communion; theſe viſible Churches are Chriſtian Churches by outward Profeſ-

The Diſtinction 'tween the viſible Church and the one true Catholick viſible Church.

ſion,

ſion, but not Parts or Members of the one Catholick Church, which is the Body and the Spouſe of Chriſt, as *Optatus* obſerves, *that beſides one Church, which is the Catholick Church, the other Churches of Hereticks, are thought to be Churches, but are not*; that is, they have the viſible Appearance of Churches, and ſo are viſible Churches, as bad men are viſible Chriſtians by a viſible profeſſion; but they are not ſuch Churches, as Chriſt will own, as he adds in another place, that *there is but one Church, which Chriſt calls his Dove and Spouſe.* So that in this Senſe men may be viſible Chriſtians, and Members of the viſible Church, and yet not Members of the one Catholick Church. Cap. 2.

Præter unam quæ eſt vera Catholica, cæteræ apud Hæreticos putantur eſſe, non ſunt: Opt. l. 1.

Quæ ſit una Eccleſia, quam Columbam & Sponſam ſuam Chriſtus appellat. Id. l. 2.

The not obſerving this, occaſioned St. *Cyprian's*, and the *African* Fathers miſtake about the Rebaptization of thoſe, who were Baptized by Hereticks or Schiſmaticks, and upon this very Miſtake, our Diſſenters at this day diſpute the validity of Orders received in the Church of *Rome*, and Mr. *B.* ſo often twits us with deriving our Succeſſion

Why Heretical Bap. him is valid.

Cap. 2. from *Rome*, which if it were true, is no Objection againſt us, unleſs he will wholly unchurch the Church of *Rome*, and aſſert that, which Mr. *Lob* charges me with; that Hereſie or Schiſm does deſtroy all relation to the Church; for if they belong to the Church ſtill, they may retain the Power of Orders, and the Adminiſtration of Sacraments among them.

And therefore to confirm this Notion, it will not be amiſs to give a plain and ſhort Account of the State of that ancient Controverſie, about the Rebaptization of Hereticks, as it was managed by St. *Cyprian* and St. *Auſtin*, as far as concerns our preſent Diſpute.

Now, 1. Both St. *Cyprian* and St. *Auſtin* were agreed, that there is but one Catholick Church, which is the Body, and the Spouſe of Chriſt; this is ſo acknowledged by all men, who are acquainted with their Writings, eſpecially their Tracts, *De unitate Eccleſiæ*, That I ſhall not need to tranſcribe any particular Sayings to that purpoſe.

2. They were agreed alſo, that there is no Salvation ordinarily to be had out of the Communion of this one Catholick Church. Both of them do over

over and over affirm this, and St. *Auſtin* asſerts, that no Body in his days denied it.

Salus, inquit, extra Eccleſiam non eſt, quis nigat? Auguſt. *de Baptiſmo contra Donat.* l. 4. cap. 17.

But, 3. St. *Cyprian* would not allow that Hereticks or Schiſmaticks did in any Senſe belong to the Church; but denies them to be Chriſtians, and conſequently that they had any Chriſtian Sacraments among them. He would not allow *Novatianus* to be a Chriſtian, or to be in the Church of Chriſt, and this was the Reaſon, why he ſo vehemently urged the neceſſity of Baptizing thoſe, who had been Baptized by Hereticks or Schiſmaticks, when they returned to the Unity of the Catholick Church; becauſe Schiſmaticks had no Church, and therefore no Baptiſm, it being impoſſible to ſeparate the Church and Baptiſm, according to the Judgment of the *African* Fathers in the Council of *Carthage*. 376

Quiſquis ille eſt, aut qualiſcunq; eſt, Chriſtianus non eſt, quia in Chriſti Eccleſia non eſt, Cypr. Ep. 52. *ad* Anton.

St. *Auſtin* on the other hand conſidered, that thoſe, who were Baptized in the Catholick Church, did not forfeit their Baptiſm by turning Hereticks or Schiſmaticks, and forſaking the

Mirum autem eſt, quomodo dicatur ſiparari à ſe & dividi omnino non poſſe Baptiſmum & Eccleſiam; ſi enim Baptiſma in Baptizato inſeparabiliter manet, quomodo Baptizatus ſiparari ab Eccleſia poteſt, & Baptiſmus non poteſt. Auguſt. de Baptiſmo cont. Donat. l. 5. ca. 15.

See St. Hierom. contra Luciferianos in Initio.

Com-

Cap. 2. Communion of the Church; for no man ever diſputed, whether ſuch Perſons upon their Repentance, might not be reſtored to the Communion of the Church without being re-baptized, which proves that the Church did not think them Infidels, for Infidels cannot be admitted into the Church without Baptiſm, and if ſuch men retain their Baptiſm, when they are out of the Church, then the Church and Baptiſm may be ſeparated, which overthrows the main Principle on which the *African* Biſhops founded their Doctrine and Practiſe of re-baptizing Hereticks.

Ita poſſe extra Catholicam Communionem dari Baptiſmum, quemadmodum & extra eam poteſt haberi——Sic & illi, qui per Sacrilegium Schiſmatis ab Eccleſiæ Communione diſcedunt, habent utiq; Baptiſmum, quem, priuſquam diſcederent, acceperunt: quod ſi foris haberi poteſt, etiam dari cur non poteſt. Ibid. l. 1. cap. 1.

From hence he concludes, that if men may retain their Baptiſm out of the Church, they may give Baptiſm out of the Church too; for the ſame Argument, whereby they oppoſed the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm by Hereticks, if it have any force, muſt prove alſo that they forfeit their own; and from thoſe Anſwers he returns to many Difficulties, wherewith he was preſt; we may

may learn his Judgment in our preſent Diſpute, in what ſenſe Hereticks and Schiſmaticks belong to the Church: which will give ſome light alſo to St. *Auſtin*'s whole Diſpute with the *Donatiſts*, which I hope will not be ungrateful to an inquiſitive Reader. Cap. 2.

As, 1. One great Difficulty is, How thoſe, who are not in the Church can adminiſter thoſe Sacraments, which belong particularly to the Church? How there can be the ſame common Sacraments to thoſe who are in the Church, and to thoſe, who are out of it? To which he anſwers, that though Schiſmaticks do forſake the Communion of the Church, yet they do not forſake the Church in every thing, and as much as they retain of the Church, ſo much they belong to it; and whatever they find of the Church among Schiſmaticks, they are bound to approve and allow, though done in a Schiſm; and therefore they dare not reject the Baptiſm of Schiſmaticks, when Perſons ſo Baptized return to the Communion of

In quo enim nobiſcum ſentiunt, in eo etiam nobiſcum ſunt; in eo autem à nobis receſſerunt, in quo à nobis diſſentiunt—— ſi ergo qui receſſit ab unitate aliud aliquid agere voluerit, quàm quod in unitate percepit, in eo recedit, & diſjungitur quod autem ita vult agere, ut in unitate agitur, ubi hoc accepit & didicit, in eo manet atq; conjungitur. Auguſt. de bapt. l. 1. cap. 1.

Cap. 2. of the Church: ſo that though St. *Auſtin* will not allow Schiſmaticks to be in the Catholick Church, whoſe Communion they have forſaken, yet they retaining ſomething, which belongs to the Church, the Chriſtian Faith, and Chriſtian Sacraments, they ſtill have ſome relation to the Church, and are not to be accounted Heathens, and Infidels, and to this he applies that ſaying of our Saviour, *He that is not againſt us, is with us*; that is, he is ſo far with us, as he is not againſt us; and therefore is not to be rejected in every thing he does, but only in thoſe things, wherein he departs from us: And therefore though Schiſmaticks are not in the Church, as having forſaken the Communion of it, yet ſo far as their Faith and Worſhip is truly Chriſtian, they muſt be acknowledged to belong to the viſible Church, as the viſible profeſſors of Chriſtianity.

Ut ergo utraq; Sententia vera ſit, ſicut vera eſt, & illa ubi ait, qui non eſt mecum adverſum me eſt, & qui mecum non colligit, ſpargit; & illa ubi ait, nolite prohibere, qui enim contra vos non eſt, pro vobis eſt, quid reſtat intuligendum, niſi quia illi in tanti nominis veneratione confirmandus fuit, ubi non erat contra Eccleſiam, ſed pro Eccleſia, & in illa tam n ſeparatione culpandus, ubi ſi colligeret ſpargeret; & ſi forte veniret ad Eccleſiam, non illud quod habebat, ibi acciperet, ſed in quo aberraverat, emendaret. Ib. cap. 7.

Mar. 9. 40.

Thus St. *Auſtin* thinks the veſſels of Honour, and the veſſels of Diſhonour, (by which the Apoſtle means ſuch Hereticks

reticks or Separatiſts as *Hymeneus* and *Philetus* 2 *Tim.* 2.) may be ſaid to be in the ſame Houſe, upon account of the ſame Sacraments. Cap. 2.

Dicit & Apoſtolus Paulus *de quibuſdam qui circa veritatem aberraverant, & fidem quorundam ſubvertebant quos cum evitandos eſſe diceret, in una tamen domo magna eos fuiſſe ſignificat ſed tanquam vaſa in contumeliam; credo quod nondum foris exierant, aut ſi jam exierant, quomodo eos dicit in eadem magna domo cum vaſis honorabilibus, niſi forte propter ipſa Sacramenta.* Ib. l. 3. cap. 19.

2. Sometimes he ſeems to make Schiſmaticks to belong to the Church, as other wicked men do, who have not forſaken the viſible Communion of it; for otherwiſe I cannot underſtand his Anſwer to that great Objection againſt the Baptiſm of Schiſmaticks, that Schiſm is ſo great a Sacriledge and Impiety, and Schiſmaticks ſuch Rebels againſt Chriſt, that we cannot think he will approve their Baptiſm, that they are Carnal, and therefore cannot give the Spirit, which is conferred in Baptiſm; to which he commonly anſwers, That the Caſe is much the ſame with reference to Baptiſm adminiſtred by bad men in the Church; thoſe who are Carnal, Covetous, Unjuſt, *&c.*

Nunquid ergo ad eandem columbam pertinent omnes avari, de quibus in eadem Catholica graviter idem Cyprianus *ingemuit? ingemuit* nam ut opinor, *raptores non columbæ, ſed accipitrices dici poſſunt, quomodo ergo Baptizabant, qui fundas inſidioſis fraudibus capiebant, &c.* Ib. l. 3. cap. 17.

And

Cap. 2. And therefore he makes Hereticks and Schiſmaticks to be only *Pſeudo-Chriſtiani*, or falſe and counterfeit Chriſtians, as all bad men are, and bad men no more to belong to the Church, than Schiſmaticks do: Thoſe who are Enemies to brotherly love, whether they be without, as Schiſmaticks are, or ſeem to be within, as thoſe who ſtill live in viſible Catholick Communion, they are all counterfeit Chriſtians, and Antichriſts. And therefore he muſt allow Schiſmaticks in ſome ſenſe to belong to the Church, as other bad men do; they have indeed made a more viſible and open Separation from the Church, but yet have not renounced Chriſtianity: And therefore he obſerves, that if thoſe, who are without, cannot have any thing that belongs to Chriſt, neither can thoſe, who are within, have any thing that belongs

Hujus autem fraternæ charitatis inimici, ſive aperte foris ſint, ſive intus eſſe videantur, Pſeudo-Chriſtiani ſunt & Antichriſti ——cum intus videntur ab illa inviſibili charitatis compage Separati ſunt. Ib. cap. 19.

Si nihil poteſt ratum & firmum eſſe apud Deum, quod illi faciunt quos Dominus hoſtes & adverſarios ſuos eſſe dicit, cur firmus eſt Baptiſmus, quem tradunt homicidæ? An hoſtes & adverſarios domini non dicimus homicidas? qui autem odit fratrem ſuum homicida eſt. l. 5. cap. 21.

Hoc tamen puto me non temere dicere, ſi foris nemo poteſt habere aliquid quod Chriſti eſt, nec intus quiſquam poteſt habere, aliquid quod Diaboli eſt, ſi enim hortus ille clauſus potuit habere ſpinas Diaboli, cur non & extra hortum potuit manare fons Chriſti. Ib. l. 4. cap. 7.

to

to the Devil; for if this encloſed Garden may have the Thorns and Thiſtles of the Devil grow in it, why may not the fountain of Chriſt flow without the Garden? in which he alludes to the Rivers of Paradice, which did not only water the Garden, but divided themſelves into all the World, as he diſcourſes elſewhere. So that the Caſe of bad men in the Church, and Schiſmaticks out of it, according to St. *Auſtin*, is much the ſame, only with this difference, That he allows bad men in the Church to be in a more hopeful Condition to become good, than Schiſmaticks are: But if he will allow bad men to belong to the Church, he muſt in ſome ſenſe allow Schiſmaticks to do ſo too, or elſe he does not fairly conclude from the Validity of Sacraments adminiſtred by bad men in the Church, to the Validity of Sacraments adminiſtred by Schiſmaticks out of the Church. Cap. 2.

Sicut ergo intus quod Diaboli eſt [redacted].

Arguendum eſt, ſic foris quod Chriſti eſt agnoſcendum eſt. c. 9.

Dixerit aliquis, interiora Zizania facilius in frumentum converti: concedo ita eſſe. c. 10.

3. In Anſwer to that captious Queſtion of the *Donatiſts*, whether Baptiſm adminiſtred by them did regenerate, which they would make a Mark of the true Church to beget Children to God by

Cap. 2. by Baptiſm; he does acknowledg not only their Baptiſm, but Baptiſmal Regeneration; but then ſays, that Baptiſm has this Effect, as it belongs to the Church, not upon account of its Adminiſtration by them: wherein they are ſeparated from the Church, they can do nothing, but as far as they continue united, as they did in the ſame Baptiſm, ſo the Sacraments of the Church will have their Effect, though their Efficacy is immediately loſt in a Schiſm, of which more preſently, which is a plain acknowledgment, that Schiſmaticks are not wholly ſeparated from the Church, as retaining ſomething, which belongs to the Church. And this he confirms by a myſtical Interpretation of the Stories of *Sarah* and *Hagar*, and *Iſaac* and *Iſhmael*; and ſays, that the Church bears Children not only by her ſelf, but by her Maids, conceived by the Divine Seed of the Sacraments, *Ergo ipſa genel. 1. c. 10. rat & per uterum ſuum & per uterum ancillarum ex ejuſdem Sacramentis, tanquam*

Quaſi vero ex hoc generet unde ſeparata eſt, & non ex hoc unde conjuncta eſt. Separata eſt enim à vinculo charitatis & pacis, ſed adjuncta eſt in uno Baptiſmate. Itaq; una eſt Eccleſia, quæ ſola Catholica nominatur, & quicquid ſuum habet in communionibus diverſorum à ſua unitate Separatis, per hoc quod ſuum in eis habet, ipſa utiq; generat, non illi neq; enim Separatio eorum generat, quod ſecum de iſta tenuerunt, quod ſi & hoc dimittant omnino non generant. l. 1. cap. 10.

The Sacram^ts are valid, tho' they are not available to ſalvation, in a Schiſm.

81, 85

ex

ex viri ſui ſemine; which how fanciful ſoever it may ſeem to be, ſhews what St. *Auſtin*'s Opinion was, that Schiſmaticks themſelves did in ſome ſenſe belong to the Church. Cap. 2.

4. But then leſt any man ſhould think, that it is no great hurt to ſeparate from the Unity of the Church, if Schiſmaticks may retain the Faith, and Sacraments of the Church, St. *Auſtin* adds, That though Schiſmaticks may have the Sacraments of the Church, yet they are not available to Salvation in a Schiſm. They have Baptiſm and give Baptiſm, but without any profit or advantage; and therefore he exhorts the *Donatiſts*, and in them all other Schiſmaticks not to be puffed up with a Conceit of what they have, but to conſider what they want, and how many great and excellent things profit nothing, when one thing is wanting, and that this one thing is Charity, which principally conſiſts in preſerving Catholick Communion, without which, whatever they have beſides, cannot procure their Admiſſion into Heaven.

Schismatical Baptism not available to Salvation, tho' valid. 80, 85, 370.

Non recte foris habetur, & tamen habetur, ſic non recte foris datur, & tamen datur; ſicut autem per unitatis reconciliationem incipit utiliter haberi, quod extra Eccleſiam inutiliter habebatur, ſic per eandem reconciliationem incipit utile eſſe, quod extra illam inutiliter datum eſt. Aug. *de bapt.* l. 1. cap. 1.

Charity conſists principally in preſerving Catholick Communion. vid. inf. 90. Def. 16.

Cap. 2. And therefore when the *Donatiſts* preſſed him with that Difficulty, ſince he acknowledged Baptiſm as adminiſtred by them to be true Chriſtian Baptiſm, which ought not to be repeated, whether this Baptiſm did waſh away ſin? For if it did, then they were the true Church, wherein alone Remiſſion of ſin is to be had; if it did not, then it is not true Chriſtian Baptiſm; and ſo thoſe who were Baptized by the *Donatiſts*, ought not to be received into the Catholick Church without Baptiſm; St. *Auſtin* anſwers this two ways, either, 1. That Baptiſm though adminiſtred by *Donatiſts*, being not their Baptiſm, but the Baptiſm of Chriſt, and the Chriſtian Church, had its effect in *ipſo temporis puncto*, in the inſtant of its Adminiſtration to waſh away ſins, but that the Guilt of theſe ſins did immediately return again, the Baptized Perſon continuing in his Schiſm: or, 2. That the Schiſm of the Perſon Baptized did hinder the efficacy of Baptiſm, as any other ſin

Non extolluntur ex his quæ habent, quid tantum per ea quæ ſana ſunt ſuperbos oculos ducunt. Et vulnus tuum dignentur humiliter intueri, nec ſolum quid aſſit, ſed etiam quid deſit, attendunt videant quam multa, & quam magna nihil poſſint, ſi unum quidem defuerit, & videant quid ſit i ſum unum. —— Charitatem utiq; non habendo, etiam cum illis omnibus, quæ nihil eis proſunt, ad æternam ſalutem pervenire non poſſunt. Ibid. cap. 9.

Ib. cap. 11. 12.

inf. 107.

ſin does, for the Grace of Baptiſm is given only to Perſons, who are qualified to receive it, and if any ſuch Perſons offer themſelves to Baptiſm, who live in any ſin unrepented of, their ſins are not waſhed away in Baptiſm, though they receive it in the Communion of the Church: But yet, when they repent of their ſins, they are not to be rebaptized, but then receive that Grace and Pardon by vertue of their former Baptiſm, which their Hypocriſie and Impenitence hindred them of when they were baptized: Thus it is with thoſe, who are baptized in a Schiſm; their ſins are not waſhed away by Baptiſm, becauſe their Schiſm ſuſpends the Vertue and Efficacy of the Sacrament, but when they return to the Communion of the Church, then their Baptiſm proves a true Laver of Regeneration. Cap. 2. Waterland on Regeneration p. 30.

From hence we eaſily learn, what St. *Auſtin's* Judgment was in this Controverſie: For, 1*ſt.* Though he would not own, That Schiſmaticks in a proper ſenſe had any Church, there being but one Catholick Church, to which the Name of Church does properly belong, as *Optatus* alſo aſſerts, That the Churches of Schiſmaticks appear to be Churches, but

Cap. 2. are not, nor, 2*ly.* would he allow them to be Members of the Catholick Church, whose Communion they have forsaken, and therefore says, they are out of the Church, and denies that Catholicks and Schismaticks have the same Church, though they have the same Sacraments. Nay, 3*ly.* He denies, That Hereticks have any Sacraments of their own, but have usurped the Sacraments of the Church, which are not rightly had, nor rightly given out of the Communion of the Church; though they are not to be repeated when they are once given, but to be compleated by Reconciliation to the Church. But. 4*ly.* Schismaticks retaining the Christian Faith and Christian Sacraments among them, though they are out of the Church, are not Heathens and Infidels, but in some sense Christians; and therefore he acknowledges, that the *Donatists* do cure those

Illud quale est, & idco putetur hæreticus non habere baptismum, quia non habet Ecclesiam? Aug. *de bapt.* l. 5. cap. 20.

Ita ergo potest Hæreticus & Catholicus Baptisma unum habere, & unam Ecclesiam non habere. Ib. cap. 21.

Non rectè foris habetur, & tamen habetur, sic nec rectè foris datur & tamen datur. Ib. l. 1. cap. 1.

Magis ergò quia pro Ecclesiæ honore atq; unitate pugnamus, non tribuamus Hæretico, quicquid apud eos ejus agnoscimus. l. 4. cap. 2.

Itaq; illi quos habuerant, sanant vulnere Idololatriæ vel infidelitatis, sed gravius feriunt vulnere Schismatis. l. 1. cap. 8.

thoſe whom they Baptize of Infidelity and Idolatry, but wound them more grievouſly with Schiſm. And therefore, 5*ly.* He owns them to be united to the Catholick Church, as far as they retain any thing of the Catholick Church among them, ſuch as the ſame common Faith, and the ſame Sacraments; but yet, 6*ly.* That what-ever they retain of the Catholick Church, though they believe the ſame Articles of Faith, obſerve the ſame Rules of Worſhip, have the ſame Sacraments rightly and duly adminiſtred among them, excepting their Schiſm, yet nothing of all this will avail them to Salvation, unleſs they return to the Communion of the Catholick Church. So that though we ſhould not agree what Name to call Schiſmaticks by, whether Chriſtians at large, upon account of their Profeſſion, without any relation to the Church, whoſe Communion they have forſaken; or, whether we ſay they are out of the Church, as having forſaken its Communion, or that in ſome ſenſe they belong to the Church, as retaining its Faith and Sacraments, or whether we own them Members of the viſible Church, as that may include the whole Number of Chriſtia-

Cap. 2.

80

87

Cap. 2. ſtian Profeſſors, as diſtinguiſhed from the one Catholick viſible Church, which contains only Catholick Chriſtians, who live in Chriſtian unity and Communion, the Difference is not great, while with St. *Auſtin* we own but one Catholick Church, and Catholick Communion, wherein Salvation is to be had. This is all I ever intended to prove, and I think no body need prove more to deter any man from Schiſm, who loves his Soul.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the Neceſſity of Catholick Communion.

HAving thus vindicated my Notion of Catholick Communion, from the Exceptions of Mr. *Baxter* and Mr. *Lob*, before I proceed any farther, it will be highly expedient to diſcourſe ſomething briefly of the neceſſity of it; for I find Mr. *Lob* mightily puzled to conceive, that thoſe who believe in Chriſt and repent of their ſins, and lead an holy Life in all Godlineſs and Honeſty, as they ſuppoſe many may do, who ſeparate from the Church of *England*, and do not live in Catholick Communion, according to my Notion of it, ſhould for this Reaſon be excluded from all the ordinary Means of Salvation. They look upon the Chriſtian Religion to be like a Syſtem of Philoſophy, and if men be careful to believe ſuch a Number of Articles, and obey ſuch Laws, without any regard to a Church-ſtate, or Church-unity and Communion, their Conditi-

182

185

Cap. 3. on is very safe, and they have a Right and Title to all the Promises of the Gospel. Holiness of Life and a good Temper of Mind, is the only thing Christ designed to promote by his Gospel; and if men be holy, however they came by it, or whatever they are besides, it matters not. This is very plausible, and a prevailing Notion in our days, which makes a great many well-disposed men extreamly indifferent, what Church they are of, so they be but watchful over their Hearts and Lives in other Matters: For will any man say, that a holy man shall not go to Heaven, when all the Promises of the Gospel are made to such Persons? When Godliness hath the Promise of the Life, that now is, and of that which is to come? Where is the Man, who has so much Courage, as to repeat the Case, which St. *Austin* puts; of a Man, *Who is Chast, Continent, void of Covetousness, no Idolater, Hospitable and Bountiful to those in Want, Enemy to no Man, not Contentious, but Patient, Quiet, without Emulation or Envy, Sober,*

Constituamus ergò aliquem castum, continentem, non avarum, non Idolis servientem, hospitalitatem indigentibus ministrantem, non cujusquam inimicum, non contentiosum, patientem, quietum, nullum Æmulantem, nulli invidentem, sobrium, frugalem, sed Hæreticum, nulli utiq; dubium est, propterhoc solum quod Hæreticus est, Regnum Dei non possidebit. Augustin. *de baptismo.* l. 4. cap. 18.

Fru-

Frugal, but a Heretick (which in St. *Auſtin*'s Language in that Place ſignifies a Schiſmatick) of ſuch a Perſon he ſays, *That no man doubts, but for this very Cauſe, that he is a Schiſmatick, he ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of God.* This it ſeems, was not St. *Auſtin*'s private Opinion, but the received Opinion of all Chriſtians in his days; that which no Body then doubted of: which makes it at leaſt worthy of our moſt ſerious and impartial Enquiry; and were men once throughly ſatisfied of the danger of Schiſm, and the abſolute neceſſity of Catholick Communion, a great many wanton Scruples, which now divide and ſubdivide the Church, would vaniſh of themſelves; for they would be then afraid to venture their Souls in a Schiſm. And therefore to make this as plain and evident as poſſible I can, I ſhall proceed by theſe following Steps; only premiſing, That the whole deſign of this Diſcourſe is pure Charity to the Souls of men, not to triumph in their Ruine and Miſery; for God forbid, I ſhould ever rejoyce in the thoughts of any Man's Damnation; for then I am ſure, I ſhould never go to Heaven my ſelf. Cap. 3.

Cap. 3. 1. I obſerve then in the firſt Place, That though holineſs of Life is the neceſſary Condition, yet it is not the meritorious Cauſe of our Salvation: *Without holineſs we ſhall never ſee God.* But that holineſs carries any man to Heaven, is in vertue of the meritorious Sacrifice and Interceſſion of Chriſt, and therefore unleſs we have a Covenant-Intereſt in this Sacrifice, nothing elſe can ſecure us of our Reward.

2. That Catholick Charity, which is exerciſed in Catholick Communion, is a principal Part of Evangelical Holineſs, without which nothing elſe will be accepted by God. Love and Charity is the great Goſpel-Command, and the peculiar Badge of the Chriſtian Profeſſion; and Chriſtian Charity, as it is diſtinguiſhed from good Nature, and an obliging Temper and Converſation, which is indeed a neceſſary moral Vertue, but not that which is peculiarly called Chriſtian Charity, does unite all Chriſtians together in one Body; is ſuch a Kindneſs for one another, as anſwers to that Tenderneſs and Sympathy, which the Members of the Natural Body have for each other: So that Chriſtian-charity neceſſarily preſerves Chriſtian-unity and

and Communion; and whoever rends and divides the Church, is void of this Christian-charity. Cap. 3.

This I have already proved at large in my Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, both from Scripture and the Ancient Fathers; and it were easie to add numerous Quotations more to this purpose. This is the principal thing St. *Augustine* insists on: he frequently applies that of the Apostle 1 *Cor.* 13. where he shews how unavailable all other Attainments are without Charity, to signifie such a Charity as preserves the Peace and Communion of the Church; and does every where assert, that that man is void of Charity, who does not love the Peace and Unity of the Church: if then Christian Charity be so necessary a part of Christian Holiness, and consists in preserving the Peace and Unity and Communion of the Christian Church, whatever other good Qualities Schismaticks may have, they want the chief branch of Holiness, without which no man shall see God, and therefore though a holy man shall never miscarry, or fall short of Heaven, yet a Schismatick with all his other good Qualities may.

Defence, p. 183. &c.

Aug. de baptismo. l. 1. cap. 9. l. 3. cap. 16. *& alibi passim.*

3. Since

Cap. 3. 3. Since the beſt men muſt be ſaved by Chriſt, and not by their own Righteouſneſs or Merits, we muſt expect to be ſaved by Chriſt only in ſuch a way, as he himſelf has appointed; It is all free *Ephes. 2. 8.* Grace, and therefore we muſt be contented to receive it in ſuch a way, as he is pleaſed to give it. He is a Debtor to no man, and therefore may well be allowed to make his own terms; Heaven is a ſupernatural State of Happineſs, which the beſt Man, ſetting aſide the conſideration of his many Imperfections and Defects, cannot challenge as the Reward of his beſt Services; and therefore God is under no other Obligation to beſtow Heaven on any man, but his own Promiſe made to us in Chriſt Jeſus, and therefore can be obliged no farther than his own Promiſe reaches: If any hard and pityable Caſe happens, he has the ſoveraign Power in his own hand, and can do, as he himſelf pleaſes, but we muſt expect no more from him, than he has promiſed.

The not conſidering this, is apt to confound mens Notions concerning the undertaking of our Saviour, and our Redemption by him: It runs ſome men into Socinianiſm, to deny the Satisfaction

on of Chriſt; and others, who cannot be ſo ſubtil, as to diſtinguiſh themſelves out of ſo plain and expreſs an Article of our Faith, and therefore do heartily and ſincerely believe the Satisfaction of our Saviour, that he dyed as a true and proper Sacrifice to expiate our ſins, and purchaſe Eternal Life for us, yet have no clear Conceptions of the Reaſon of this, which will not well comply with thoſe other Notions they have of God, and his natural Obligation, not to call it natural Neceſſity, to love and reward good men. Cap. 3.

I do as firmly believe God's Goodneſs to good men, and his Love to true Holineſs, where-ever he ſees it, as I do any Article of my Creed, but then I conſider, that Heaven is a ſupernatural Happineſs, and not the natural Reward of an earthly Creature, as man by Nature is: And therefore the beſt man, conſidered as a Man, has no more reaſon to expect, That God as a Reward of his Vertue, ſhould tranſlate him from Earth to Heaven, than that he ſhould give him wings to flie in the Air, and to viſit the ſeveral Planets; all that can be expected from God upon account of the Goodneſs or Juſtice of his Nature, is to beſtow 100

Cap. 3. ſtow ſuch a Happineſs on innocent or deſerving Creatures, as their Natures were made for, that is, an earthly Happineſs on an earthly Creature, which was all that was promiſed *Adam* in Paradice, an immortal, happy Life in this World.

So that if we conſider the State of mankind, we ſhall find, that the whole Work of our Redemption, is wholly owing to free Grace, that is, that which was neither due to our Natures, nor what we could reaſonably expect from God, conſidered only as our Maker.

Man in Innocence was but an earthly
1 Cor. 15. Creature, *the firſt* Adam *was of the Earth and earthy*; And an earthly Creature cannot challenge as his natural Birthright, an heavenly and divine ſtate of Life: *For Fleſh and Blood*, though innocent and pure, *cannot inherit the Kingdom of God.* A groſs, earthly Body cannot aſcend into Heaven, nor dwell in thoſe pure Regions of Light, and therefore ſuch a Creature can no more challenge Heaven, as its natural Portion and Inheritance, than it can, that God ſhould change its Nature, and refine an earthy into a ſpiritual Body.

If

If we conſider man in his lapſed State, he has forfeited even an earthly Immortality, and cannot now challenge an immortal Life in this World, much leſs in the next; For what natural Reaſon can there be, when we ſuffer Death as the Puniſhment of ſin, for God, to raiſe our dead Bodies out of the Duſt again into an immortal Life. So that whatever may be the Reward of Vertue in this World, an immortal Life after Death cannot be the natural Reward of it; for then it could not be in the Evangelical Notion of it, the Gift of God, or the Purchaſe of Chriſt. *Rom. 6. 23.* Cap. 3.

And we may conſider farther, that as man is now deſigned for a ſupernatural ſtate of Happineſs in Heaven, ſo much advanced above the original ſtate of humane Nature, ſo there is required a divine Holineſs and Vertue to fit and qualifie him for this ſupernatural Happineſs. Upon this account our Saviour ſo earneſtly preſſes the Neceſſity of the new Birth, that we muſt be born of Water and of the Spirit, if we would enter into Heaven: *For that which is born of the Fleſh, is Fleſh, but that which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit*: Whereby our Saviour ſignifies to us, that we muſt attain

Cap. 3. tain to ſuch a pitch of Goodneſs, as is as much above the original Attainments of an earthly and fleſhly Nature, as Heaven is above the Earth: For that ſaying of our Saviour, *That which is born of the fleſh, is fleſh*, is true in a ſtate of Innocency; Innocent fleſh is fleſh ſtill, and therefore we muſt be born into a diviner State than innocent fleſh, if we would enter into Heaven; that is, we muſt attain to ſuch a divine and ſpiritual frame of Mind, as raiſes us above this World, and prepares us for an Angelical ſtate of Life: For there are different degrees of Vertue fitted to the different ſtates of a reaſonable Nature: Unleſs we will ſay, that the Vertue of a Man, and of an Angel is the ſame. That degree of Vertue which is ſufficient to teach a Man to uſe the good things of this World innocently and happily, is not ſufficient to raiſe a Man above the World, and to make him contemn all bodily Pleaſures and earthly Satisfactions.

The higheſt and nobleſt Attainments of Chriſtianity would be no Vertues in an earthly ſtate: Were we to live always happily in this World; were this the beſt and moſt perfect ſtate we could expect,

it

it would be no Vertue, but a great in- Cap. 3. Waterland's Suppl. to Nat. & Rev. p. 6–12.
ſtance of Folly to deſpiſe the good things of this Life, and to live above them: For in ſuch a State, the delights and ſatisfactions of Fleſh and Senſe would be an eſſential part of our Happineſs, and whatever is ſo, cannot and ought not to be deſpiſed: It always becomes a reaſonable Creature to govern all his appetites and deſires by the Laws of Reaſon, and to mortifie and ſubdue his inordinate Affections, as that ſignifies to correct the Extravagancies of them; but yet in an earthly ſtate he may indulge himſelf to the full in all lawful Enjoyments, and is not bound to lay reſtraints upon himſelf, nor to endeavour to ſtifle and ſuppreſs his ſenſual Inclinations, nor to deny them their proper and natural ſatisfactions: That is, he who is to live always in this World, and has no bigger or diviner Happineſs to expect, is not bound to die to this World, while he lives in it. So that all thoſe Evangelical duties of Self-denial and Mortification, and Contempt of this World, and heavenly Mindedneſs, can be no Vertues nor Duties in any earthly ſtate, much leſs a life of Faith, and hope of unſeen things, when we have no unſeen things promiſed to us,

Cap. 3. as the Object of our Faith and Hope, but have our Portion at preſent, and expect only a circular and endleſs Repetition of the ſame Enjoyments. The Laws of Vertue muſt be proportioned to the State and Condition of Man-kind, and muſt alter and vary with it; that which becomes an earthly Creature, who is to live always in this World, and in this Body, which as far as we know, was the Original ſtate of Man-kind, does not become one, who muſt put off this Body, and lives in this World, not as his home, and place of reſt, but as a probation-ſtate, for a better and more ſpiritual Life. That Vertue, which teaches us how to live happily in this World, and that which muſt prepare us for the Happineſs of the next, muſt differ as much as Earth and Heaven, as Fleſh and Spirit: And this I take to be the true difference between Moral Vertue, and Evangelical Graces; the firſt is proportioned to the ſtate of a reaſonable Creature, inhabiting an earthly Body, without any expectations of a more Divine and Spiritual Life, the ſecond includes a Reſpect to the other World, and that Angelical Happineſs, which Chriſt has promiſed to his ſincere Diſciples.

The Difference betwixt Moral Virtue and Evangelical Graces.

vid. inf. 286.

The

The Religion then of our Saviour, being as much above Nature, as that Glory and Happineſs is, which is reveal'd and promiſed in the Goſpel, it is neceſſary we ſhould have ſome more divine Principle to raiſe us into this divine Life, than meer Nature is; for Nature can never act above it ſelf; and that the Goſpel tells us, is the holy Spirit of God, whereby we are Renewed and Sanctified, and have the divine Nature formed in us; and this being above Nature, no conſidering man will ſay, that the Gift of the Holy Spirit is owing to our Natures, or that God is under any natural Obligation, as our Maker, to beſtow it on us. Cap. 3.

The Reſult of which is this, that the Gift of the Holy Spirit, whereby we are born again, and prepared and qualified for a divine and immortal ſtate of Life, being an act of pure Grace, and wholly owing to the Mediation of Chriſt, God may diſpence it upon what terms, and in what manner he pleaſes, and we muſt expect it only in that way, which God has appointed for the beſtowing of it. 286

I need not inſiſt now on the Pardon of our ſins, which all Mankind own to be an Act of Grace, which we can upon

Cap. 3. no account challenge without a Promiſe, nor upon any other Terms and Conditions, nor in any other way, than what is promiſed.

So that the whole Work of our Redemption is an Act of pure Grace, which we cannot challenge from the natural
93 Goodneſs of God, nor from his natural Relation to us, as we are his Creatures, and therefore muſt thankfully accept of it, in what way God pleaſes to give it, and not quarrel with him, if he do not give it to thoſe, who will not have it in his way.

4. And therefore I obſerve in the next Place, That all the Bleſſings of the Goſpel are promiſed to us in a Church-ſtate.
112 This is ſo fully, and hitherto ſo unanſwerably proved by Dr. *Sherlock* in his Diſcourſe of our Union and Communion with Jeſus Chriſt, and in his Defence and Continuation of that Diſcourſe in anſwer to Mr. *Ferguſon*, that would men be at the Pains to turn to thoſe Books, there need be nothing ſaid to it here; however that this Treatiſe may not be wholly defective in ſo material a Point, I ſhall ſpeak ſomething briefly to it, and refer thoſe, who have a mind to ſee this Matter more fully debated

Diſcourſe of our Union, &c. to Chriſt. Chap. 4. ſect. 1. 142 Defence, & Continuat. c. 5. p. 399.

bated to the aforeſaid Diſcourſes. Cap. 3.

1. Then, That Chriſt did intend to erect a Church in the World, and to unite all his Diſciples into one Religious Society, is ſo univerſally acknowledged, that it is a needleſs trouble to prove that which no body denies; no man denies that Chriſt has a Church, and that he intended to have one, only the ſeekers know not where to find it, now methinks, if Chriſt have inſtituted a Church, wherein he requires all his Diſciples to communicate as Members of the ſame Body, it goes a great way towards proving, that the ordinary Means of Salvation are to be had only in the Communion of this Church; for to what purpoſe is this Church inſtituted, if not for a common Body and Society of thoſe, who ſhall be ſaved by Chriſt? No Society can be founded or maintained but by ſuch Priviledges and Immunities, as make it deſirable to enter into it, and continue in it; without this all Kingdoms and Common-wealths, Cities, and Families would disband, for nothing can tie men together, who are naturally giddy, and fond of Innovations, but ſome ſenſible Advantages, which they cannot otherwiſe enjoy. And therefore

Cap. 3. the Church being a ſpiritual Society, and the great end of its Inſtitution, the Salvation of ſinners, it is not reaſonable to think, that Chriſt would inſtitute a Church, without obliging Chriſtians to preſerve the Peace and Unity of it, at the Peril of their Souls, if they do not.

2. And therefore I farther obſerve, That the Goſpel-Covenant is the Charter, whereon the Church is founded. The Blood of Chriſt is the Blood of the Covenant, the Covenant of Grace being purchaſed and ſealed by the Blood of Chriſt; and therefore let us conſider, whether this Covenant be made with particular men, conſidered as ſingle and ſcattered Individuals; or as incorporated into a Church. Now in general we are told, that Chriſt *is the Saviour of the Body*, and that he has *redeemed his Church with his own Blood*, which confines the Effects and Application of his Grace, and Merit, and Satisfaction to his own Body, which is the Church. But beſides this we may conſider, That the *Jewiſh* Church was Typical of the Chriſtian Church, nay indeed, that it is the ſame Church ſtill, only enlarged and Chryſtianized; for the Chriſtian Church

Eph. 5. 23.

is

is built upon the foundations, not only of the Apoſtles, but Prophets; and Jews and Gentiles are united into one Church, by breaking down the middle wall of partition, and engrafting the Gentiles upon the ſame Root and Stock with them, as I diſcourſed at large in the *Defence of Dr. Stillingfleet.* Cap. 3. *p.* 152. 163.

Now we know the *Moſaick* Covenant was made with the Children of *Iſrael*, as a Nation, whom God had choſen for himſelf of the Seed and Poſterity of *Abraham*: Natural *Jews* had no Title to this Covenant, till they were circumciſed and incorporated into the Body of *Iſrael*, conſidered as in Covenant with God, of which Circumciſion was the Sign and Seal; and no ſtrangers were admitted to theſe priviledges of the Covenant, till they were engrafted into the Body of *Iſrael* by Circumciſion, and became one People with them: So that the *Moſaick* Covenant, which was but the Chriſtian Covenant in Types and Figures, was confined to a particular Nation, or Body of men, and to all thoſe, who were incorporated into the ſame Body with them; now it is plain, that the Chriſtian Church is incorporated into the Body of *Iſrael*; and therefore the Apoſtles call the

Cap. 3. the Chriſtians, the true *Iſrael* of God, and all the Names of *Iſrael* are given to the Chriſtian Church. *A choſen Generation,*

347 1 Pet. 2. 9. *a royal Prieſthood, an holy Nation, a peculiar People*: So that the Chriſtian Church is a Nation, and People peculiar to God, and choſen by him out of the reſt of the World, as the *Jews* formerly were, that is, united to God and to each other in the ſame Covenant, and therefore as the *Moſaical* Covenant was confined to the Body of *Iſrael*, that no Strangers or Aliens had any right to it, ſo is the Goſpel Covenant confined to the Communion of the Chriſtian Church: And therefore Chriſt is ſaid to give himſelf for us, to redeem us from all iniquity, and to purifie to himſelf a peculiar People, zealous of good Works. λαὸν περιούσιον

2 Tit. 14. or εἰς περιποίησιν, as it is in St. *Peter*, which is one of the Names of *Iſrael*, as they were a Nation, a peculiar Body and Society of men, ſeparated from the reſt of the World.

3. To confirm this, we may conſider, that it is not enough that Chriſt has died for us, and purchaſed the Pardon of our ſins, and the Gift of the holy Spirit, unleſs this Pardon and Grace be applyed to us in ſuch ways, as he has appointed.

For

For it will not ſuffice, that we make Chriſt our own, by a fanciful Application of his Merits to our ſelves, which would quickly overturn the Church, and make the Inſtitutions of our Saviour very uſeleſs things, as we ſee this conceit has in a great meaſure done already, but we muſt receive Chriſt and all his Bleſſings, as he is pleaſed to beſtow them. Cap. 3.

Now that the holy Sacraments of Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper are by the Inſtitution of our Saviour, the ordinary Conveyances and Miniſtries of Grace, has been the univerſal Belief of the Chriſtian Church in all Ages; in Baptiſm we receive the Remiſſion of our ſins, and the Gift of the holy Spirit; and therefore we are ſaid, *to be baptized for the Remiſſion of ſins*, and *to be born of Water and of the Spirit*, and we are ſaid *to be ſaved by the waſhing of Regeneration, and the renewal of the holy Ghoſt.* 3 Titus 5.

In the Lord's Supper Chriſt gives himſelf to us as the Bread of Life, which is the daily Food and Nouriſhment of our Souls, of which the Manna in the Wilderneſs was but a Type; *The Cup of Bleſſing, which we bleſs, is the Communion of the Blood of Chriſt*, (that Blood which

See Dr. *Sherlock's* practical Diſcourſe of religious Aſſemblies. part 2.

Cap. 3. which was ſhed for the remiſſion of Sins) *and the Bread which we break is the Communion of the Body of Chriſt*: That is, in this holy Sacrament all the Merits of Chriſt's Death and Sufferings are made over to worthy Communicants. Here we receive the freſh Supplies of the holy Spirit, and therefore are ſaid *to drink into one Spirit*; but I need not inſiſt on the proof of that, which no body denies, who has any Reverence for our Saviours Inſtitutions, and does not think them meer empty Shadows, and inſignificant Ceremonies.

1 Cor. 10. 16.

Ch. 12 13.

If then our Saviour has appointed theſe holy Sacraments as the Means and Conveyances of Grace, and theſe Sacraments are ineffectual to thoſe, who do not live in the Unity and Communion of the Chriſtian Church, then we cannot ordinarily expect the Application of Chriſt's Merits to us, orthe Vertue of his Death and Paſſion, out of Catholick Communion.

And yet this was as generally acknowledged by the ancient Fathers, as the other, as I have already ſhown: St. *Cyprian* would not acknowledg, that Schiſmaticks had any Sacraments, no more, than that they had any Church; St. *Auſtin*

p. 72, &c.

Auſtin acknowledged that they had Sacraments, but *inutiliter*; their Schiſm made the Saeraments ineffectual to attain the end for which they were inſtituted; and indeed the very Nature of the Sacraments will eaſily ſatisfie us, that it muſt be ſo. Cap. 3. *Supr.* 80.

Baptiſm is the Sacrament of Pardon and Forgiveneſs, of our Regeneration and new Birth by the holy Spirit; but it is the Sacrament alſo of our initiation and incorporation into the Chriſtian Church: And upon this very account our ſins are forgiven in Baptiſm; and the holy Spirit is beſtowed on us, becauſe it makes us the Members of Chriſt's Body, that is, of his Church, to whom the Forgiveneſs of ſins, and the Gift of the holy Spirit is promiſed; and therefore thoſe who are baptized in a Schiſm, and are no ſooner made the Members of Chriſt's Church, but do immediately divide and ſeparate themſelves from its Communion, if they do receive remiſſion of their Sins, and the Gift of the Spirit in the inſtant wherein they are baptized, as St. *Auſtin* ſuppoſes they may, yet do immediately forfeit it again by their Schiſm: For the ſame Sacrament muſt have its entire effect, or none at all; *Supr.* 82.

Gap. 3. all; Incorporation into the Chriſtian Church, and forgiveneſs of ſins, are inſeparably united in Baptiſm, as God's and man's part is in the ſame Covenant: Incorporation into the Chriſtian Church, which is ſignified, repreſented, and compleated in Baptiſm, is our part of the Covenant, our choice and reſolution, and actual undertaking of Chriſtianity, which is done by a Profeſſion of our Faith in Chriſt, and ſubjection to him, and by uniting our ſelves to the Society and Fellowſhip of his Church, by ſuch a ſacred Right, as he has appointed for that purpoſe: Forgiveneſs of ſin, and the Gift of the holy Spirit, is God's part of the Covenant, who has promiſed to forgive the Sins, and renew and ſanctifie thoſe with his Spirit, who thus ſolemnly devote themſelves to the Faith and Obedience of a crucified Jeſus, and therefore theſe two can never be ſeparated, unleſs God will perform his Part of the Covenant, whether we perform ours or not.

Thus the holy Supper of our Lord does as plainly repreſent the Unity of the Chriſtian Church, and the Communion of all Chriſtians with each other, as it does their Union to Chriſt, and partici-

participation of the Merits of his Death and Sufferings: For the Apoſtle tells us, there is but one Bread, as there is but one Body; *For we being many, are one Bread and one Body, for we are all partakers of that one Bread*: And upon this account it is called *the Communion of the Body of Chriſt*, and therefore the Body of Chriſt cannot be received in a Schiſm; for where there is a Schiſm, it is no longer *one Bread and Body*, nor the *Communion of Chriſt's Body*, when it is divided into different and oppoſite Communions. That which is the common Bread of all Chriſtians, muſt be received in Unity and one Communion; for it loſes its Nature, Vertue, and Efficacy, in a Schiſm. Thus the Paſchal Lamb, which was a Type of Chriſt's Death and Paſſion, and of the Chriſtian Feaſt of the Lord's Supper, as it was to be eaten by the whole Body of *Iſrael*, ſo every particular Lamb was to be eaten in one Houſe, and nothing to be carried out of it. Cap. 3. 1 Cor. 10. 17.

The like may be ſaid of all the other Means of Grace, which cannot avail any man, who does not live in the Peace and Communion of the Church: Our Prayers are effectual only in the Merits

Cap. 3. Merits of Christ's Sacrifice and Intercession, and if such men have no interest in the Sacrifice of Christ, as they cannot have, if they have no Title to the Supper of our Lord, which is the Christian Feast upon the Sacrifice of the Cross, and applies the Merits and Vertue of it to us, then their Prayers cannot be prevalent neither; and if our Saviour would not allow any man to offer any Sacrifice to God, who had a private quarrel with his Brother, till he had reconciled himself to him, how unlikely is it, that God will hear the Prayers of those men, who are at variance with the Church of God, and divide the Communion of it.

1 Cor. 3. 6. As for hearing and reading, *Paul* may Plant, and *Apollos* may Water, but it is God, that gives the Increase, and if God deny his Grace and Spirit to such external Ministries, they can avail nothing, and yet we have already heard, how little reason such men have to expect it. St. *Paul* tells us, that Christ *gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers, for the perfecting of the Saints for the Work of the Ministry*, but the end of all is, *For the edifying of the*

4 Ephes. 11, 12.

body

body of Christ : So that all Ministerial Gifts are for the edification of Christ's Body, which supposes, that their efficacy and influence is confined to the Communion of the Church, and does not reach the Conventicles of Schismaticks. And he adds, *But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is Christ the Head, from whom the whole body fitly joyned together, and compacted by that which every joynt supplyeth, according to the effectual working in the Measure of every Part, maketh increase of the Body, to the edifying of it self in Love.* So that the Increase and Edification of Christians is in the Unity of the Church, and consists in the encrease of brotherly Love and Christian Charity, Vertues which cannot be learn't in a Schism, nor preserved in it, a bitter zeal, and envenomed Passions, and uncharitable Censures and Surmises, and evil speaking, and an insolent contempt of all, who are not of their Party and Faction, being the most usual fruits of a Schismatical Reformation.

Cap. 3. v. 15, 16.

All the Metaphors whereby the conveyance of Grace from Christ to his Church is represented in Scripture, do plainly signifie that this is done in Unity,

Cap. 3. ty, ſuch as the influences which the Body receives from the Head, or the Branches from the Vine, which do not reach thoſe Members which are ſeparated from the Body, nor thoſe Branches, which are broken off from the Vine.

The reſult of what I have ſaid, is this, If Holineſs be not the meritorious Cauſe, but only the condition of our Salvation, and therefore cannot ſave us, ſeparated from the Merits of Chriſt; if Catholick Unity, that is, Chriſtian Charity, be one main eſſential part of Evangelical Holineſs, without which nothing elſe will be accepted by God; if the Work of our Redemption from firſt to laſt, be an Act of free Grace, which we cannot challenge from God, as due to our Natures, nor as a neceſſary Effect of his own Goodneſs, conſidered as our Maker; and therefore is as entirely at God's choice, in what way, and upon what conditions he will diſpence it, as it was, whether he would do any ſuch thing at all; if we muſt expect to receive the Bleſſings of the Goſpel only in ſuch ways, as God hath appointed, and if Chriſt hath confined all the Grace of the Goſpel to a Church-ſtate; this is ſufficient to ſatisfie any unprejudiced man,

man, how neceſſary Catholick-unity and Communion is, without which we cannot upon any good grounds hope for the pardon of our Sins, the influences of God's Grace, or eternal Life. Cap. 3.

4. But there are ſome men, who will never be ſatisfied by the moſt clear and demonſtrative Proofs, that a thing is ſo, unleſs they can ſee the Reaſon why it ſhould be ſo; a way which of late has mightily prevailed, and has in a great meaſure thruſt all revealed and inſtituted Religion out of the World. We cannot always give the natural Reaſons of things, not becauſe there are none, but becauſe they lie too deep for us to diſcover them, and if we cannot fathom Nature, which is more expoſed to our view and obſervation, how unreaſonable is it to think to fathom the unſearchable Counſels of God, in ſuch Matters as wholly depend upon his Soveraign Will, and have no apparent Cauſe, but his own good pleaſure: Matters of Revelation can be diſcovered only by Revelation, and in ſuch Acts of ſoveraign Grace, it is abundantly ſufficient, if God tell us what he will do for us, and in what way he will do it, without aſſigning the Reaſon, why he does ſo.

Cap. 3. But yet to ſatisfie theſe men, as much as may be, let them but aſſign a Reaſon, why Chriſt would have a Church, and why he would have but one Church, and I will give them a manifeſt and neceſſary Reaſon, why Salvation ſhould be confined to the Communion of this Church, and that is, becauſe it is impoſſible to preſerve the Unity, Diſcipline, or Government of the Church without it.

The Chriſtian Church conſidered as a Church, is not armed with any ſecular coercive Power, and if it have no ſpiritual Power neither, how ſhall it maintain and preſerve it ſelf againſt all the oppoſitions of Men and Devils? and yet it can have no ſpiritual Power, if men may as well be ſaved out of the Church, as in it: For who then will regard the Unity of the Church, value its Cenſures, or reverence its Authority and Government? Spiritual Power is exerciſed upon the Souls and Conſciences of men, and reſpects the Happineſs of the other World, as temporal Power Governs the outward man, and reſpects this preſent Life; now all the Power Chriſt hath given to his Church, is that, which we call the Power of the Keys, to take in, or to

to ſhut out of the Church, which is no Power at all, if the Communion of the Church be ſo indifferent a thing, that men may be as ſafe out of the Church as in it. All the Cenſures of the Chriſtian Church, which are purely Spiritual, only reſpect Church-communion, and therefore their Authority too depends upon the neceſſity of this Communion: Some were caſt out of the Church, others received into the Number of Penitents, of which *Albaſpinæus* reckons four degrees in the Primitive Church, which were the different Degrees of their Separation from Chriſtian Communion; now how eaſily may a man, who believes no neceſſity of Catholick Communion, deſpiſe all this Authority, and all theſe Cenſures, and there can be no neceſſity of it, if our Souls be not greatly endangered by the want of it.

And yet our Saviour calls this Power of receiving in, and ſhutting out of the Church, *The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven, and whatſoever thou ſhalt looſe on Earth, ſhall be looſed in Heaven.* Now how can the Keys of the Church to let

16 Mat. 19

Cap. 3. in, or to ſhut out, be called the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, unleſs there be a neceſſary Relation between the Communion of the Church on Earth (which is alſo called the Kingdom of God) and the Kingdom of Heaven, that thoſe who are in the Communion of the Church, and have a Right to be in it, have a Title alſo to the Kingdom of Heaven, and that thoſe who are out of the Church, either by their own Choice, or by a juſt Cenſure, have no Title to the Kingdom of Heaven, and ſhall never enter into it. That the Church on Earth, and the Church in Heaven is but one Communion, and that no men are tranſplanted into the Church in Heaven, but from the Communion of the Church on Earth; upon which account the Peace of the Church, which was given to dying Perſons under Cenſures, was called the *Viaticum*, or a kind of Paſs into the other World: And when our Saviour ſo expreſly aſſerts, whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven, and whatſoever thou ſhalt looſe on Earth, ſhall be looſed in Heaven, if by binding and looſing we will underſtand putting out, or receiving into the Church, it makes the Communion

nion of the Church abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation. Cap. 3.

And I farther obſerve, that what in St. *Matthew* is called the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and binding and looſing, is in St. *John* called retaining or remitting ſins, *Whoſoever ſins ye remit, they are remitted, and whoſoever ſins ye retain, they are retained* : And therefore if we expound this remitting and retaining ſins, by binding and looſing in the exerciſe of the Keys, as in all reaſon we muſt; then to remit ſins, is to reſtore men to the Peace and Communion of the Church, and to retain them, is to caſt men out of the Church, or to keep them under Church-cenſures; which is a plain demonſtration, that ſins are forgiven only in the Communion of the Church. Joh. 20. 23

So that whatever other Reaſons our Lord might have, in confining Salvation ordinarily to the Communion of the Church, among which the Promoting of Catholick Love and Charity among his Diſciples and Followers is none of the leaſt, which as I obſerved before, cannot be maintained and preſerved in a Schiſm; yet here is one manifeſt Reaſon for it, that the Authority, and Diſcipline, *p.* 111.

Cap. 3. and Government of the Church, without which the Church cannot well subsist, does wholly depend on it.

If Christ have instituted a Church, and invested it with such Authority and Power, as is necessary to preserve it self, and to promote the great ends of Church-Society, and the Church, as a spiritual Society can have no other Power, and has no other given it by Christ, but what results from the necessity of Catholick Communion, we need not wonder, that the pardon of Sin, and the assistances of the divine Grace, and everlasting Life, should be confined to the Communion of the Church, because the Church cannot Preserve it self, nor Govern its own Members, can neither Instruct, Reprove, nor Censure with any Authority and Effect, without this, which by the way shows us, how effectually those men, who separate from the Church, upon a pretence of purer Worship and a purer Discipline, overthrow and contradict their own pretences, and tear up the very foundations of all Church-authority; for if separation from the Church be so slight and indifferent a Matter, there can be no Authority in the Church; for any man who is uneasie, or humersom, or

the Pretence of purer Worship & purer Discipline 373, &c

or ungovernable in the Communion of the Church, may leave it if he pleaſes, and joyn himſelf to ſome other Communion, or ſet up a new Communion of his own, without any danger; and in this Caſe nothing can keep People together, but ſome great Art and Cunning in their Guides, or ſome ſecular Advantages, or arbitrary Covenants, and I think the Independents have great reaſon on their ſide to found a particular Church, on a particular Church Covenant, if there be no neceſſity of Catholick Communion, as I have now deſcribed it; for if there be no eſſential and inherent Authority in the Church, there can be no other than what depends upon private Contracts. Cap. 3.

Now may we not as well wonder, why humane Laws inflict ſuch ſevere Puniſhments upon Rebels, whatever other good qualities they may have, as that Chriſt ſhould ſo ſeverely puniſh Schiſmaticks, who may upon other Accounts paſs in the World for very good men; the Reaſon of both is the ſame, Government in Church and State is of ſuch mighty Conſequence, to the temporal and ſpiritual Happineſs of Mankind, and Rebellion and Schiſm ſo deſtructive to *Supr.* 69.

Cap. 4. all Government, that thoſe men deſerve the ſevereſt Puniſhments, who diſturb the Peace and Eſtabliſhment of Church or State; and Schiſm is ſo much worſe than Rebellion, as the happineſs of the Souls of men, is of much greater Concernment, than their temporal Eaſe and Felicity.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the Unity of Church-Power.

AND now I am come to the main ſeat of the Controverſie, between me and Mr. *Lob*, Mr. *Humphrey*, and Mr. *Baxter*, not to mention the Country-Conformiſt, who is ſuch an inſignificant Appendage and Hanger-on, as a ſilly flie is to a Wheel, though poſſibly he may have no more wit, than to fancy that he has raiſed all this duſt and ſtir.

They charge me with advancing a *Caſſandrian* deſign, and promoting an Union with the Church of *Rome*, rather than with Proteſtant Diſſenters. And to inſinuate the belief of this into his Rea-

Readers, Mr. *Lob* endeavours to prove, Cap. 4.
that Arch-Biſhop *Laud* had this deſign in his head; but what is this to me? I am no Arch-Biſhop yet, and greatly ſuſpect, I never ſhall be; if he can prove that the Arch-Biſhop died like a Papiſt, or a Phanatick, with a lye in his mouth; or that he attempted any reconciliation with the Church of *Rome*, which is not conſiſtent with the Principles, or Practices of the Primitive Church, I think he was very much to blame for it, and am very glad he did not perfect his Deſign; but could a Reconciliation be obtained upon the principles of Primitive and Catholick Chriſtianity, accurſed be the man, who would hinder this Union, which I would be glad to effect, not only with ſhedding my Blood once, but if it were poſſible a thouſand times, with all the Scorn and Obloquies of the moſt virulent Phanaticks into the Bargain.

But whatever Mr. *Lob* may fancy, I look upon this, as a very hopeleſs and impractible deſign, and never had ſuch a vain Conceit in my head, while I was a [illegible]iting the late Defence, and had any one Whiſpered ſuch an accuſation in my Ear, without at the ſame time, ſhewing the folly and weakneſs of the Charge,

Cap. 4. I ſhould have been more puzzled, to have found out the Riſe and Occaſion of it, than to have anſwered all the Cavils againſt the Church of *England*, which I have ever yet ſeen.

But though I knew nothing of a *Caſſandrian* Deſign, yet my Adverſaries have found me out, and if we will believe Mr. *Lob*, I am got at leaſt as far as *France*, in my Journey to *Rome*, ſurely there is ſome Conjuring in the Caſe, for I don't know, that ever I went a ſtep beyond *Canterbury*. But this is a Cauſe, which will not bear an Ignoramus, and therefore I muſt defend my ſelf as well as I can; and in order to that, I ſhall 1. briefly repreſent the Doctrine of the Defence, with reſpect to the Unity of Church-power and Government, whereon this Charge of *Caſſandrianiſm* is founded, 2. Conſider what the Doctrine of *Caſſander* was in this matter, 3. Examine the Arts my Adverſaries have uſed to pervert the Senſe of my words, to turn them into Non-ſenſe and Ridicule, and to draw me head-long into the Popiſh Plot.

1. As for the firſt, in order to prove that the Unity of the Catholick Church conſiſts in one Communion, I aſſerted, that

that all the Bi ſhops of the Church, are but one [redacted], inveſted with the ſame Power and Authority to Govern the Church, that as St. *Cyprian* tells us, *There is but one Epiſcopacy, part of which every Biſhop holds with full Authority and Power :* That all theſe Biſhops are but one body, who are bound to live in Communion with each other, and to govern their reſpective Churches, where need requires, and where it can be had, by mutual advice and conſent, and therefore that no Biſhops are abſolutely independent, but are obliged to preſerve the Unity of the Epiſcopacy, or Epiſcopal Colledge, as *Optatus* calls it, whereon the Unity and Communion of the Catholick Church depends; for it is impoſſible the Catholick Church ſhould be one Body or Society, or one Communion, if it be divided into as many independent Churches, as there are abſolute and independent Biſhops; for thoſe Churches muſt be independent, which have an independent Power and Government, as all thoſe muſt have, which have independent Governors or Biſhops, and independent Churches can never make one Body, and one Catholick Communion, becauſe they are not Members of each other;

Cap. 4.

Defence of the unreaſ. of Separation. p. 208.

vide Dr. Sherlock's Vindic. of some Protestant Principles p. 38. 4to. 1688.

Cap. 4. other; and thus the Unity of the Catholick Church muſt be deſtroyed, unleſs we aſſert one Epiſcopacy, as well as one Church, one Evangelical Prieſthood, as well as one Altar, all the World over.

But to make this as plain as poſſibly I can, that every one may underſtand it, who will; I ſhall reduce the whole ſtate of this Controverſie, under ſome few heads.

1. There is but one Epiſcopacy, becauſe all the Biſhops of the Catholick Church have originally the ſame Authority and Power in Church Affairs; no one has the whole, but each of them has a part and equal ſhare, and therefore they are called the Epiſcopal Colledge, and a copious Body of Biſhops, as all the Churches in the World are one Catholick Church, not becauſe they ever do, or ought to meet together for Advice and Counſel, and Acts of Government from all parts of the World; no more than the Catholick Church does for Acts of Worſhip; but becauſe they are, and ought to be in Communion with each other, they have all the ſame Power and Authority, which muſt be exerciſed in one Communion.

2. Though

2. Though all Biſhops have a Relation to the whole Church, every Biſhop being a Biſhop of the Catholick Church, yet the Rules of Order and good Government, and the Edification of the Church, require, that the Exerciſe of this Power be in ordinary Caſes limited and confined to a certain Part, which we call a particular Church, for as no particular Biſhop can Inſtruct and Govern the Catholick Church, no more than he can be in all parts of the World at the ſame time, ſo every Biſhop will be capable of exerciſing his Office to the beſt Advantage, when his Care is confined to a certain Place, and particular Church; and every particular Church, is likely to receive the greateſt Benefit from the Care and Inſpection of a fixed Paſtor and Biſhop. Cap. 4.

3. That the ſame Rules of Order and Government, require, that every Biſhop have the chief Power of Government in his own Dioceſs, for if every Biſhop had Authority as often as he pleaſed, to intermeddle in another Biſhops Dioceſs, and order the Affairs of his Church, it muſt needs cauſe great Confuſion and Diſtraction in all Churches, and make the People very uncertain, whom they

are

Cap. 4. are to obey, and therefore it has been the conſtant Practice of the Apoſtles, and all ſucceeding Ages, to ſet Biſhops and Paſtors over particular Churches, and to confine their Care and Inſpection to them.

4. But yet the Power of every Biſhop in his own Dioceſs, is not ſo Abſolute and Independent, but that he is bound to preſerve the Unity of the Epiſcopacy, and to live in Communion with his Collegues, and Fellow-Biſhops; for this is the Foundation of Catholick Communion, without which, there can be no Catholick Church; and therefore he, who cauſeleſly breaks this Unity, can be no Catholick Biſhop; and this is the Foundation of all thoſe greater Combinations of Churches, and that Authority, which is regularly exerciſed over particular Biſhops by their Colleagues.

For, 5. To preſerve the Peace and Unity of the Epiſcopacy, it is neceſſary, that every Biſhop do not only obſerve the ſame Rule of Faith, but eſpecially in matter of Weight and Conſequence, the ſame Cuſtoms and Uſages, and the ſame Laws of Diſcipline and Government; and therefore it is highly expedient and neceſſary, when any difficult Caſe

Caſe happens, for which they have no ſtanding Rule, to adviſe and conſult with each other, not as with ſuperior Governors, who are to determine them, and give Laws to them, but as with Friends, and Colleagues, of the ſame Body and Communion. And this makes it highly reaſonable for neighbour Biſhops, at as great a diſtance, as the thing is practicable with Eaſe and Convenience, as the Biſhops of the ſame Province, or the ſame Nation, to live together in a ſtrict Aſſociation and Confederacy; to meet in Synods, and Provincial or National Councils, to order all the Affairs of their ſeveral Churches by mutual Advice, and to oblige themſelves to the ſame Rules of Diſcipline and Worſhip; this has been the Practice of the Church from the very beginning, and ſeems to be the true Original of Archi-Epiſcopal, and Metropolitical Churches, which were ſo early, that it is moſt probable, they had their beginning in the Apoſtles days; for though all Biſhops have originally equal Right and Power in Church-Affairs, yet there may be a Primacy of Order granted to ſome Biſhops, and their Chairs, by a general Conſent, and under the Regulation of Eccleſiaſtical Canons, for the preſervation Cap. 4.

Cap. 4. ſervation of Catholick Unity and Communion, without any Antichriſtian Encroachments or Uſurpations on the Epiſcopal Authority.

For, 6. This Combination of Churches and Biſhops does not, and ought not to introduce a direct Superiority of one Biſhop or Church over another, or of ſuch Synods and Councils over particular Biſhops: Every Biſhop is the proper Governor of his own Dioceſs ſtill, and cannot be regularly impoſed on againſt his Conſent; the whole Authority of any Biſhop or Council over other Biſhops is founded on the Laws of Catholick Communion, which is the great end it ſerves, and therefore they have no proper Authority, but only in ſuch Matters, as concern the Unity of the Epiſcopacy, or the Peace and Communion of the Catholick Church. If a Biſhop be convicted of Hereſie or Schiſm, or ſome great Wickedneſs and Impiety, they may depoſe him, and forbid his People to communicate with him, and ordain another in his ſtead, becauſe he ſubverts the Unity of the Faith, or divides the Unity of the Church, or is himſelf unfit for Chriſtian Communion; But if a Biſhop differ from his Colleagues aſſembled in Synods,

nods, or Provincial Councils, or one National or Provincial Council differ from another, in Matters of Prudence, and Rules of Diſcipline, without either corrupting the Faith, or dividing the Church, if we believe St. *Cyprian*, in his Preface to the Council of *Carthage*, they ought not to deny him Communion upon ſuch accounts, nor to offer any force to him in ſuch Matters. Thus St. *Cyprian*, and the *African* Fathers differed from *Stephen* Biſhop of *Rome*, and his Colleagues, about the re-baptization of Hereticks, but yet would not divide the Church, nor the Unity of the Epiſcopacy upon that Score, for any Biſhop to diſſent from his Colleagues, and obſtinately adhere to his own private Opinions, without very great and neceſſary Reaſons for doing ſo, is great frowardneſs and Inſolence, which may be condemned and cenſured; but while he preſerves the Unity of Faith, and Catholick Communion, whatever Church or Council ſhould deny Communion to him, would be guilty of the Schiſm; which plainly ſhews, that there can be no conſtitutive Regent Head on Earth of a National, much leſs of the Catholick Church; ſince every Biſhop is the

Cap. 4.

228

Cap. 4. ſupreme Governor of his own Church, and though he may, and ought to take the Advice of neighbour Biſhops or Councils, yet he is not under their Authority, any farther than the Purity of the Faith, or the Unity of the Church is concerned; nor yet is ſo abſolute and independent, but that he is bound to live in Communion with his Colleagues, and as much as is poſſible, govern his Church by mutual Advice and Conſent, and if he divide the Church by Hereſie or Schiſm, he may be depoſed, and caſt out of Chriſtian Communion.

Theſe things I have diſcourſed at large upon ſeveral occaſions in the Defence, and proved them from primitive Practiſe, and have now reduced them into this plain Method, that if it be poſſible to prevent it, it may not be in the Power of my Adverſaries a ſecond time, to form a Popiſh or *Caſſandrian* Plot, out of ſuch Anti-*Caſſandrian* Principles.

2. It is time now to conſider, what *Caſſander* taught about this Matter. *George Caſſander* was a very learned and moderate Papiſt, who in Obedience to the Command of the Emperors, *Ferdinand* and *Maximilian*, writ his Conſul-

A. 1564.

tation,

tation, wherein he gives his judgment of every Article of the *Auguſtan* Confeſſion, which was drawn up by *Melanct hon*, and dedicated to *Charles* the fifth. The ſeventh Article concerns the Church, and there we muſt ſeek for his Judgment in this matter; and yet there I can find nothing to Mr. *Lob*'s purpoſe, who has named *Caſſander* indeed, but not cited any one paſſage out of him. Cap. 4. 1530

Caſſander expreſly aſſerts, *That to the Unity of the Catholick Church is required obedience to one ſupreme Governor, who ſucceeds* Peter *in the Government of Chriſt's Church, and in the Office of feeding his Sheep, and that this is agreeable to the ſenſe of the Ancient Church.* And that *it is evident from all the Records of the Church, That the chief Authority in the Univerſal Church of Chriſt has always been yielded to the Biſhop of* Rome, *as* Peter's *Succeſſor, who ſits in his Chair*; For the Proof of which he refers us to the Teſtimonies of *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Optatus*, and others.

Quod autem ad unitatem hujus externæ eccleſiæ requiruntur obedientiam, unius ſummi Rectoris, qui Petro in regenda Chriſti eccleſia, & ejus ovibus paſcendis ſucceſſerit, non eſt à conſenſu priſcæ quoq; eccleſiæ alienum. Caſſ. *Conſ. ad art. 7. de Pontifice Romano. Conſtat etiam olim, quatenus extat memoria eccleſiæ, præcipuam ſemper authoritatem in univerſa Chriſti eccleſia Epiſcopo Romano ut Petri ſucceſſori. & ejus cathedram obtinenti, delatam fuiſſe*——Id. ib.

Cap. 4.

It is very true, as Mr. *Lob* obſerves, that there have been ſome, who have advanced the Authority of a General Council above the Pope of *Rome*, and that this is a prevailing Opinion among the French Papiſts, and thence concludes, *That ſuch as aſſert, that a General Council is the Political Head, or Regent part of the Univerſal Church, are in the Number of French Papiſts*; which is an Argument of his great Skill in Controverſie.

Reply. p. 31.

For ſuppoſe there be any ſuch men, who aſſert a General Council, to be the Political Head or Regent Part of the Univerſal Church, but renounce all the pretended Authority of the Pope of *Rome*, and all Communion with him; are theſe men Papiſts or not? If they be, then it ſeems, that thoſe who renounce the Pope, may be Papiſts ſtill, and then let Mr. *Lob* and his Friends look to themſelves, who are in as fair a way of being Papiſts, as any men I know, notwithſtanding their renouncing the Pope of *Rome*, and General Councils; if they be not Papiſts, then they are not French Papiſts, unleſs French Papiſts be no Papiſts.

But

But Mr. *Lob*, if he had been at all acquainted with theſe Matters, would eaſily have perceived, that all who plead for the ſupreme Authority of General Councils, do not therein renounce the Authority of the Pope of *Rome*, and therefore are Papiſts ſtill, call them *French* or *Caſſandrian* Papiſts, or what you pleaſe; and that thoſe, who renounce the Authority, and all dependance on the Pope, can be no Papiſts, how zealous ſoever they are for the Authority of General Councils. Cap. 4.

It were eaſie to diſcourſe largely upon this Argument, but a few plain Proofs are as good as a thouſand. Mr. *Lob* inſtances in the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, but if he had ever ſeen more than the Names of thoſe Councils, he would have found, how little they ſerved his purpoſe. I grant they do decree, that a General Council is above the Pope, in determining Matters of Faith, in compoſing Schiſms, and in reforming the Church in its Head and Members; but ſtill they attribute ſuch a ſoveraign Authority to the Biſhop of *Rome*, as no Power on Earth can equal, or match, but only a General Council. This is ſo evident and notorious, that whoever

Cap. 4. caſually opens theſe Councils, can hardly miſs of ſomething to this purpoſe, and therefore I ſhall only produce two or three plain and undeniable Proofs of it, and refer my Readers, who deſire farther ſatisfaction, to the Councils themſelves.

When *Amedeus* the Duke of *Savoy*, who called himſelf *Felix* the *5th*, was elected Pope by the Council of *Baſil*, they call his Office, *ſummus Apoſtolatus*, the chief Apoſtleſhip, or the ſupreme Biſhoprick, and declare to all Chriſtian People that they muſt obey him, as the only, the true, the undoubted Paſtor of the *Roman* Church, under the neceſſity of Salvation, and that, whatever their Rank and Quality be, Emperors, Cardinals, Patriarchs, Kings, Biſhops, Abbots, or whatever other Eccleſiaſtical or Civil Honour or Power they enjoy.

Declarans eidem Electo tanquam unico vero & indubitato eccleſiæ Romanæ Paſtori, ab omnibus Chriſti fidelibus de neceſſitate ſalutis obediendum fore, & debere obediri, ac eiſdem Chriſti fidelibus quacunq; etiamſi Imperiali, Cardinalatus, Patriarchali, Regali, Pontificali, Abbatiali, ſeu alia quavis eccleſiaſtica vel mundana prefulgiant dignitate, Concil. Baſil. ſeſſ. 40.

Romanus Pontifex decretorum hujuſmodi Executor & Conſervator precipuus. Ib. ſeſſ. 42. ſummi pontificatus apicem.

They acknowledg the Biſhop of *Rome* to have the executive Eccleſiaſtical Power in his hands, and call the Popedom,

The

the Top of Eccleſiaſtical Power, and *Nicholas* the 5*th.* who after all this ſtir, was owned Pope by this Council, in his Bull of Confirmation of the Council of *Baſil*, attributes to himſelf a fulneſs and plenitude of Power. Cap. 3.

Libenter ſecundum noſtræ & Apoſtolicæ authoritatis plenitudinem.... Bulla Nicolai Papæ 5. in Conc. Baſ.

But to put this out of doubt, the Council it ſelf has adjuſted this Diſpute about the Authority of the Pope, and a General Council; for after ſome debate about this Matter, it concludes, *Who now can doubt of the Power of Councils, being Superior to all other Powers, which has been proved by ſuch irrefragable Teſtimonies? from whence it manifeſtly appears, that thoſe Authorities which have been alleadged for the Power of the Supream Biſhop, do not prove, that the Pope himſelf is not bound to obey the Decrees of the Univerſal Church, or General Council; but they prove only this, that all particular men, and particular Churches, are bound to obey the Pope, unleſs in ſuch Matters as are prejudicial to this Holy Sy-*

Quis jam de poteſtate Conciliorum ſuper omnes alias poteſtates ambigere poterit, tot irrefragabilibus teſtimoniis comprobata? ex his manifeſte conſtat auctoritates, quas de ſummi poteſtate Pontificis allegaſtis, non probare quo minus ipſe Pontifex mandatis univerſalis eccleſiæ & Concilii generalis obedire teneatur; ſed id duntaxat probant, quod omnes ſingulares homines, & particulares eccleſiæ ipſi Pontifici obedire debent, niſi in his, quæ huic ſacræ ſynodo, & cuilibet altari legitimè congregatæ, præjudicium generent. Concil. Baſil. reſponſio ſynodalis de auctor. Concil. General.

Cap. 4. *Synod, or any other, which is lawfully assembled.*

This is sufficient to inform Mr. *Lob*, that men may assert the Authority of General Councils, and yet if they reject the Authority of the Bishop of *Rome*, they are not Papists, nor true Catholicks in the sense of the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*; both which ascribe the soveraign Authority to the Pope in the vacancies of Councils, and command all men under pain of Damnation, even Emperors, Patriarchs, Princes, Prelates, to obey him in all things, which are not derogatory to the Decrees or Authority of general Councils.

But it may be, the French Church has proceeded farther in retrenching the Authority of the Pope, than the Council of *Constance* or *Basil* did, and therefore since Mr. *Lob* talks so much of French Papists, I shall briefly shew his skill in this also.

Ibid. Sherlock's 2 Ind. of some Prot. Principles, p. 57.

I presume *Petrus de Marca* the Learned Arch-bishop of *Paris*, who writ in Defence of the Liberties of the *Gallican* Church, is a good competent Witness in this Matter, and yet in his Book, *de Concordia Sacerdotii & Imperii*, which met with so many Censures at *Rome*, and

and ſo difficultly paſſed the Teſt, and kept him ſo long out of his Biſhoprick, he aſſerts the Authority of the Pope, much higher than either of thoſe Councils; and to ſhorten my Work, I ſhall only ſet down ſome Propoſitions, which he himſelf collected out of his Book, in anſwer to the *Roman* Cenſure. Cap. 4.

1. That the Biſhop of *Rome* has always exerciſed the chief Power in Eccleſiaſtical Affairs in the *Gallican* Churches, ever ſince Chriſtianity flouriſhed there. 1 *Supremam in rebus eccleſiaſticis authoritatem per Gallias exercuiſſe Romanam pontificem, judiciis ad relationes & appellationes redditis ab eo tempore quo fides Chriſtiana in Galliis floruit, ad hanc uſq; ætatem.*

2. That the Pope is the Head of the Univerſal Church by divine Right, and therefore of the *Gallican* Church, which is a Member of the Univerſal Church. 2. *Papam jure divino eſſe univerſalis eccleſiæ caput, atq; adeo Gallicanæ, quæ illius eſt membrum.*

3. That the general Decretals of the *Roman* Biſhops, have been ſent into *France*, as well as into other Provinces; and received with great Applauſe by the *Roman* Emperors, and the *French* Kings, from the firſt foundation of that Kingdom, till this preſent Age. 3 *Generalia decreta a Romanis Pontificibus in Gallias, æquè ac in reliquas provincias miſſa, quæ magno applauſu ab Imperatoribus Romanis, deinde à Francorum, regibus poſt conſtitutum regnum, uſq; ad hanc ætatem ſuſcepta ſunt.*

4. That

Cap. 4.

4. *Nullum esse crimen cujus ratione Papa deponi possit, exceptâ hæreseos publicâ professæ causa, quod verum esse testimoniis veterum docetur, & præterea hanc esse antiquam ecclesiæ Gallicanæ definitionem demonstratur.*

4. That no Crime is a sufficient Reason for deposing the Pope, except the publick Profession of Heresie; and that this is true, he proves by the Testimonies of the Ancients, and besides shews, that it has been of old the Judgment and Definition of the *Gallican* Church.

5. *Papam solvere posse & dispensare valide & licite à canonibus conciliorum Generalium, etiam sine causa, dummodo hæc dispensatio non tendat ad labefactandum ecclesiæ statum.*

5. That the Pope can effectually and lawfully dispense with the Canons of general Councils, even without any Cause, so long as such a Dispensation does not weaken the State of the Church.

6. *Libertates ecclesiæ Gallicanæ consistere in usu & praxi Canonum atq; decretaliu̇m, tam veterum quam recentiorum, easq; non pendere à sola praxi antiquorum Canonum. Ubi ostenditur necessitate cogente Pontifices variis temporibus pro bono publico ecclesiæ, ad novas leges condendas progressos.*

6. That the Liberties of the *Gallican* Church, consists in the Use and Practise of Canons and Decretals, both Ancient and Modern, and is not confined only to the Practise of Ancient Canons; where he shews, that at several times, in case of necessity, Popes have proceeded to make new Laws for the publick Good of the Church.

7. That

7. That the Pope, beſides his primacy over the Univerſal Church, is the only and immediate Patriarch of the Weſtern and *Gallican* Churches, and that Kings have no Right or Power to erect any New Biſhoprick, Metropolitical Seat, much leſs a Patriarchate. Cap. 4.

7. *Papam, præter eum primatum, quo univerſæ eccleſiæ præeſt, ſolum eſſe & immediatum occidentis & Galliarum Patriarcham, Regibus vero non competere jus aliquod Epiſcopatum vel metropolim inſtituendi, multo minus Patriarchatum. Libra Cenſuræ Romanæ in prolegom. ad librum de Concordia ſacerd. & Imp.*

This is a brief Scheme of *French* Popery, as it reſpects the Government of the Church, if we believe this great Arch-biſhop, Men may aſſert the Authority of a General Council, without being Papiſts; but no man can be a Papiſt, who does not acknowledg the Biſhop of *Rome* to be the ſupreme Head, and univerſal Paſtor of the Chriſtian Church, whom all Princes, Prelates, and People are bound to obey; in Communion with whom conſiſts the Unity of the Catholick Church, and to ſeparate from whom is a Schiſm: All Papiſts muſt own the Biſhop of *Rome* for their univerſal Paſtor, though they are not agreed whether his Power be abſolute, or under the Controul of a general Council.

3. Having

Cap. 4. 3. Having thus prepared the way, it will be no hard Matter to vindicate the doctrine of the Defence, about the Unity of Church-power, from thoſe ridiculous and ſenſeleſs Imputations of *Caſſandrianiſm* and *French* Popery. This Charge is managed ſo knaviſhly by Mr. *Lob*, who hath put in words of his own to make out the Charge, when my words would not do it; and with ſuch blind fury by Mr. *Baxter*; with ſo much confuſion, and yet with ſo much Triumph by both, that there needs no other Art to expoſe and ſhame them, than to ſet my Notions in a true light once more, and to vindicate them from the artificial miſ-repreſentations of ignorance, or a Scholaſtick Buffoonery.

The Sum of their Charge amounts to this; that I place the ſupreme governing Power of the Church in a general Council, and that the Unity of the Church conſiſts in the Subjection of all particular Chriſtians and Churches to a general Council; and yet they are forced to acknowledg, that I diſown a Conſtitutive Regent Head of a National, or of the Univerſal Church: And here they cry out of Contradictions, and exerciſe their gueſſing faculty, what ſhould

ſhould be the meaning of it; and yet hold to the Concluſion in ſpight of Nonſenſe and Contradiction, that I ſet up one ſoveraign Power over the Univerſal Church. Cap. 4.

As for Contradictions, I will conſider them anon, but the firſt thing to be done is to examine, what occaſion I have given them to think, that I place the ſupreme *unifying Power* (as Mr. *B.* calls it) of the Church in a general Council.

Mr. *Lob* lays it down, as his fundamental Charge againſt me, that I make *the Univerſal Church the firſt Seat of Government*, Or, as he learnedly ſpeaks, the Πρῶτον δικτυον *of Church Government, that it is a Political organized Body, in which there is a* pars imperans & ſubdita, *The Biſhops in their Colledge being the Governors, Or,* pars Imperans, *and all others of the univerſal Church, the ſubdite part*, which others would have called Subjects, and that in the very next words he adds. *It may be our Author, to gratifie the Dean, will deny the univerſal Church to be a Political organized Body, as indeed he doth*: So that it ſeems I deny, what he ſays, I aſſert, which either proves, that I did not underſtand my ſelf, Reply. p. 27. 31.

Cap. 4. ſelf, or that Mr. *Lob* does not, or will not underſtand me; and which of theſe is moſt likely, comes now to be tryed.

Only we muſt firſt obſerve, what he means by the *univerſal Church, being the firſt Seat of Government*, that *it is a Political organized Body*, in which there is one ſupreme and ſoveraign Power over the Whole: As a Kingdom is one Pollitical organized Body, becauſe it is under one ſupreme Government, and all the Power of inferior Officers is derived from the King, as the ſupreme governing Head, or as the Papiſts make the Catholick Church one Political organized Body, and the Pope, or a General Counsil the Conſtitutive Regent Head of it.

Now then let us hear, how he proves this Charge againſt me, that I make the univerſal Church the firſt Seat of Government, and ſuch a Political organized Body, as he here talks of: And to this purpoſe he alleadges ſeveral things, which ſhall be particularly, but briefly conſidered.

Reply, p. 27. 1. He alleadges, that I aſſert, *That all Church Officers belong to the univerſal Church, and have one original Right, to govern the whole univerſal Church*: Theſe

are

are none of my words, nor do they re- Cap. 4.
preſent my ſenſe: Every one who reads
this Propoſition, as Mr. *Lob* has expreſ-
ſed it, would imagine, that I made eve-
ry Biſhop as ſoveraign a Monarch of the
Church, as the Pope of *Rome* is; where-
as all that I ſay in that paſſage, he cites
out of the Defence, is no more but this.
(1. *That the Apoſtles had a Relation to*
the whole Church, and as he obſerves, I
aſſert in another place, That *every Biſhop,* Ib. p. 11.
Presbyter, or Deacon by his Ordination, is
made a Miniſter of the Catholick Church:
That every Biſhop and Presbyter receives
into the Catholick Church by Baptiſm, and
ſhuts out of the Catholick Church by Ex-
communication, which they could not
do, if they were not Miniſters of the
Catholick Church; but does this make
every Biſhop an univerſal Monarch, that
he is a Biſhop of the univerſal Church?
Or will Mr. *Lob* deny, that Biſhops or
Presbyters have a Relation to the uni-
verſal Church? If they be Miniſters of
the Church, and there be but one
Church, they muſt be Miniſters of the
Catholick Church; for particular
Churches, are not Churches, but conſi-
dered as Members of the Catholick
Church; and therefore the primary Re-
lation

Cap. 4. lation of all Catholick Chriſtians, and Catholick Biſhops, is to the Catholick Church. This proves indeed, that the whole Catholick Church is but one Body, and one Communion; but it does not prove, that there is but one ſupreme Regent Head of the Catholick Church.

2. That the ordinary Power of a particular Biſhop, or the Exerciſe of the Epiſcopal Office is confined to a certain place, or particular Church, which certainly does not make them the ordinary Governors of the whole univerſal Church.

3. I aſſert, That though the Exerciſe of their Epiſcopal Power is ordinarily confined to a particular Church, yet they continue their Relation to the whole Church; that is, in their Government of their particular Churches, they act as Biſhops and Miniſters of the univerſal Church; for they are Biſhops of particular Churches, not conſidered meerly as particular, but as Members of the univerſal Church. And if Mr. *Lob* meant no more but this, by making the univerſal Church the firſt Seat of Government, that all the Power in the Church primarily reſpects the univerſal Church, though

though as it is diſtributed into different hands, the Exerciſe of it is confined to particular Places and Churches, I readily own the Charge, and may do ſo ſafely without making the Church, ſuch an organized Political Body, as has one Conſtitutive Regent Head over the Whole. Cap. 4.

4. I aſſert farther, That Biſhops being Miniſters of the Catholick Church, when Neceſſity, that is, when the preſervation of the Catholick Faith, or Catholick Communion, require it, may with one conſent oppoſe the Hereſie or Schiſms of neighbour Biſhops; depoſe thoſe, who are incorrigible; and Ordain others in their ſtead; and as far as it is poſſible take care, that no part of the Church of Chriſt ſuffer any injury by the Hereſie or evil Practiſes of any of their Colleagues. And if Mr. *Lob* will hence infer, that every Biſhop has an original Right to govern the whole univerſal Church, he muſt have a Logick by himſelf, or ſome great flaw in his Underſtanding or Conſcience. Every Biſhop is a Biſhop of the univerſal Church, and therefore as far as the Rules of good Order and Government, Catholick Peace and Communion, and the poſſi-

Cap. 4. bility of things will permit, he may exerciſe his Epiſcopal Office in any part of the Chriſtian Church, but this does not give him an original Right to govern the whole Church.

Ib. p. 11. 2. Mr. *Lob* obſerves, that I ſay, *The Catholick Church is united and coupled by the Cement of Biſhops, who ſtick cloſe together, for which I produce* Cyprian; and therefore I hope, there is no Popery in this, unleſs St. *Cyprian* alſo, were a *Caſſandrian* or *French* Papiſt. For may not Biſhops ſtick cloſe together in one Communion, unleſs there be a ſupreme Conſtitutive Regent Head of the Church? Or, can the Church be one, unleſs the Biſhops, who are the ſupreme Eccleſiaſtical Governors of their ſeveral Churches, be one alſo?

3. But I aſſert, *that the Unity and Peace of the Epiſcopacy is maintained by their governing their Churches by mutual Conſent*; Therefore not by one Conſtitutive Regent Head. But he ſays, I mention, *Collegium Epiſcopale*, or *Epiſcopal Colledge*, So indeed I obſerved *Optatus*, called the whole Body of Biſhops, and upon the ſame account, St. *Cyprian* and St. *Auſtin* calls them Colleagues. But this *Epiſcopal Colledge*, he ſays, *He*

Def. p. 209

takes

takes to be a Council of Biſhops, But that is his miſtake, and a very ſilly one it is; and he might as well conclude, that when the Fathers ſpeak of the Unity of the Epiſcopacy, they mean their Union in a general Council. In St. *Cyprian's* time there never had been a general Council, excepting the Council of the Apoſtles at *Jeruſalem*; and yet, when he writ to Forraign Biſhops, with whom he was never joyned in Council, nor ever like to be, he calls them his Colleagues, or thoſe of the ſame Colledge with him; which ſignifies no more, but that they were of the ſame Power and Authority in the Church, and united in the ſame Communion. Cap. 4.

And yet Mr. *Lob* takes hold of this Phraſe of *the Epiſcopal Colledge*, to make me expreſly aſſert the ſupreme Authority of general Councils. *That every part of the univerſal Church, is under the government of the univerſal Biſhops aſſembled in their Colledge, or in Council.* Which Sentence he very honeſtly puts into a different Character, that it may be taken for mine, and makes it a diſtinct head of accuſation, when I never writ nor thought any ſuch thing; but this is the dealing we muſt expect from p. 12.

Cap. 4. thoſe men, whoſe Underſtandings and Conſciences are formed only to ſerve a party.

Well, but *theſe Biſhops have an original Right and Power in relation to the whole Church*, this has been conſidered already, only he adds an untoward (*i.e.*) which is ſuch another honeſt Expoſition, as turning an Epiſcopal Colledge into a Council. For, (*i.e.*) ſays Mr. *Lob*, *The Forraign Biſhops, as thoſe of* Alexandria *and* Rome, *&c. have an original Power and Right in relation to the whole Church, a Right and Power in relation to* England. Now this is very true in the ſenſe in which I aſſert it: The Biſhop of *Rome* and *Alexandria* have ſuch a relation to the Church of *England*, and ſo have all the Biſhops in the World, that if they live in the ſame Communion with us, and ſhould come over into *England*; with the leave of *Engliſh* Biſhops, they might exerciſe their Epiſcopal Office in any Church in *England*; as *Polycarp* conſecrated in the Church of *Anicetus* at *Rome*: A Catholick Biſhop does not loſe his Character by going out of his own Church, but is a Biſhop in what part of the World ſoever he be; and therefore may exerciſe his Epiſcopal Office,

Office, as far as is conſiſtent with the Rules of Order and Chriſtian Communion, and with the Rights and Juriſdiction of other Biſhops. Cap. 4.

Nay, were there nothing elſe to alter the Caſe, but only the local diſtance between *Rome*, and *England*, and *Alexandria*; the Biſhops of *Rome* and *Alexandria* might admoniſh and cenſure the *Engliſh* Biſhops, in caſe they fell into Hereſie or Schiſm, and deny them Communion in caſe of obſtinacy or incorrigibleneſs; and ſo may the *Engliſh* Biſhops admoniſh thoſe of *Rome*, and *Alexandria*, and inflict the like Cenſures on them: The Unity of the Epiſcopacy conſiſts in one Communion, and all the Authority of the Church reſults from the neceſſary Obligations to Chriſtian Communion; and all Churches muſt judge for themſelves by the Rules of Catholick Communion, what Churches to hold Communion with; and though we muſt expect, while Biſhops are men, and ſubject to the Weakneſſes, Paſſions, Miſtakes of humane Nature, they may be guilty of great miſcarriages, and deny Communion to each other upon inſufficient Reaſons; yet there is no help for this, that I know of, but either the

Mo-

Cap. 4. Mediation and Interposition of other Churches, or an Appeal to the last Judgment: That obligation all Churches are under, as far as in them lies, to preserve the Purity of the Faith, and the Unity of the Church, obliges them to reject the Communion of those, who violate either; but it withal obliges them, as they will answer it at the Tribunal of Christ, the great Bishop of his Church, not to make any unnecessary breaches, or lightly and wantonly refuse each others Communion.

But by the Original Right and Power of the Bishop of *Rome*, or *Alexandria*, or other Forraign Bishops in relation to the Church of *England*, he seems to mean a Right of Appeals and proper Jurisdiction, as he plainly does in what he adds a little after, concerning the Independency of the Church of *England*, on any Forraign Power: For because I assert the Bishops are not wholly independent, he concludes, *That the Church of* England *is not independent, but accountable to Forraign Bishops, if at any time they abuse their Power.* And some Pages after confutes this, by saying, That, *'tis notorious, that the Church of* England *established by Law, is a particular*

Reply, p. 12. p. 28.

cular National Church, independent on any Forraign Power whatſoever. Such is the Conſtitution of our Church, that what Biſhop ſoever is found an abuſer of his Power, he is not accountable to any Colledge of Biſhops, but ſuch as are convened by his Majeſties Authority, and that what apprehenſions ſoever he may have of his being griev'd through any undue procedure, he cannot make any appeal to any Forraign Power from the King. And therefore he thinks, I incur a Premunire, by ſetting up a Forraign Juriſdiction over the Church of *England.* Cap. 4.

Now this is ſo wild and abſurd a Concluſion, from any thing I have ſaid, that none but Mr. *Lob*, or ſome few of his ſize could have hit on't; there is but one Epiſcopacy in the Chriſtian Church, of which every Biſhop has an equal Share and Portion, and therefore is a Biſhop of the Catholick Church, and though the Exerciſe of his Epiſcopal Office and Authority, is regularly and ordinarily confined to a particular Church, yet his original Right and Power in relation to the whole Church does ſtill remain, *i. e.* He is a Biſhop in all parts of the World, and may exerciſe his Epiſcopal Authority where-ever he be, as far as is conſi-

Cap. 4. ſtent with the Rules of Order and Catholick Communion; and when neceſſity requires, is obliged to take care, as far as poſſibly he can, that the Church of Chriſt ſuffer no injury by the Hereſie or evil Practiſes of any of his Colleagues; *ergo*, the *Church of* England *is ſubject to the Authority of the Biſhop of* Rome, *or* Alexandria. But I believe few men can diſcern, how ſuch a Conſequence reſults from ſuch Premiſſes, and what follows, is of the ſame ſtamp.

All Biſhops have originally equal Authority in the Church of Chriſt, but yet are not ſo independent, but that they are bound by the Laws of Chriſt to preſerve the Peace and Unity of the Epiſcopacy, and to live in Communion with their Fellow Biſhops, and in caſe of Hereſie, Schiſm, or notorious Impiety, may be cenſured and depoſed by their Colleagues, and others ordained in their ſtead, *Ergo, The Church of* England *is ſubject to the Biſhop of* Rome, *or* Alexandria, *or other Forraign Biſhops.*

I have abundantly proved in the Defence, that St. *Cyprian* owns theſe Premiſſes, but denies the Concluſion, and therefore either he, or Mr. *Lob*, are out

in

in their Logick, when St. *Cyprian* had Excommunicated two of his Presbyters, *Felicissimus* and *Fortunatus*, and they fled to *Rome* to *Cornelius* to make their Complaints to him; St. *Cyprian* writes a Letter to *Cornelius*, wherein he informs him of the whole Matter, and has this remarkable passage in it: *That it was by a general Consent agreed among them, and is in it self equal and just, that every ones Cause should be heard there, where the Crime is committed; since every Pastor has a Portion of the Flock committed to him, which he is to Rule and Govern, so as he is to give an Account of it to his Lord, and therefore those, who are under our Government, ought not to run about from one Bishop to another, nor by their subtil and fallacious insinuations engage those Bishops, who are at Unity among themselves, in contests and quarrels, but should there plead their Cause, where they may have both Accusers and Witnesses of their Crime.* Thus St. *Cyprian* rejects the Appeal of *Basilides*

Cap. 4.

Nam cùm statutum sit omnibus nobis, & æquum sit pariter ac justum, ut uniuscujusq; causa illic audiatur, ubi est crimen admissum, & singulis pastoribus portio gregis sit ascripta, quam regat unusquisq; & gubernet rationem sui actus Domino redditurus, oportet utiq; eos, quibus præsumus, non circumcursare, nec Episcoporum concordiam cohærentem sua subdola & fallaci temeritate collidere, sed agere illic causam suam, ubi & accusatores habere, & testes sui criminis possint. Cypr. ep. 55. ad Cornelium.

Cap. 4. *des* and *Martialis*, two *Spanish* Bishops, to *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome*, when they had been justly deposed by their Colleagues, and *Felix* and *Sabinus* ordained Bishops in their stead.

Cypr. ep. 68.

Thus when *Marcion* for his lewdness had been Excommunicated by his own Father, Bishop of *Sinope*, he fled to *Rome*, but was denyed Communion there, and they gave this reason for it, *We cannot do this without the leave of thy venerable Father, for there is but one Faith, and one Consent, and we cannot go contrary to thy Father, our good Colleague and fellow Labourer.*

Οὐ δυνάμεθα ἄνευ τῆς ἐπιτροπῆς τοῦ τιμίου πατρὸς σοῦ τοῦτο ποιήσαι. μία γὰρ ἐστὶ πίστις, καὶ μία ὁμόνοια, καὶ οὐ δυνάμεθα ἐναντιωθῆναι τῷ καλῷ συλλειτουργῷ πατρὶ τῷ σῷ. *Epiph. her.* 42.

From these instances it appears, that the Unity of the Episcopacy, or Episcopal Colledge, does not give Authority to every Bishop, to intermedle with the Affairs of another Bishop's Diocess, but only in case of absolute necessity, for here are two things to be distinctly considered, which qualifie each other, and set bounds to the Ecclesiastical Government. 1. That there is but one Episcopacy, in which every Bishop has an equal share; Christ hath committed the

Care

Care of his whole Church to the Biſhops of it, who are to maintain Unity and Communion among themſelves, and as far as it is practicable, and as occaſion requires, govern the Church with mutual Advice and Counſel, and one Conſent, as if they were but one Biſhop. And, 2. That every Biſhop has a Portion of the Flock aſſigned to his particular Care, over which in ordinary Caſes, he has the ſole and ſupreme Authority; for though the Church of Chriſt be but one Flock, yet it is not committed in common to the Care of all Biſhops, but is divided into ſeveral Folds with particular Paſtors ſet over them, to inſtruct and govern, and take Care of them; and as every Biſhop and Paſtor is more peculiarly concerned, than any other, to render an account of that part of the Flock committed to his Charge, ſo it is fit, he ſhould have the greateſt Authority and Power over them; all Biſhops have an equal Power and Authority in the Church, but the ordinary exerciſe of this is confined to their own Churches, in which each of them is ſupreme. Cap. 4.

Now the firſt of theſe, the Unity of the Epiſcopacy, is the foundation of thoſe larger Combinations and Confe-

deracies

Cap. 4. deracies of neighbour Churches, which make Archiepiſcopal or National Churches, for ſince there is but one Epiſcopacy, it is highly reaſonable and neceſſary, that as far as it is practicable (as it is in the Churches of the ſame Province or Nation) they ſhould all act, and govern their reſpective Churches, as one Biſhop, with one conſent; which is the moſt effectual way to ſecure the Peace and Unity of the Epiſcopal Colledge, and to promote the Edification and good Government of the Church.

Nay, this Unity of the Epiſcopacy is the Foundation of that Authority, which neighbour Biſhops have over their Colleagues in caſe of Hereſie and Schiſm, or any notorious Wickedneſs, for they being Biſhops of the univerſal Church, have an original Right and Power to take care, that no part of the Church, which is within their reach and inſpection, ſuffer by the Hereſie or evil Practiſes of their Colleagues.

[not to govern their Collegues but] Shorlock's Vind. of some Protest. Principles, p. 26. 4to.

But the ſecond Conſideration, that every Biſhop has the chief Power in his own Church, preſcribes the Bounds and Limits of this Eccleſiaſtical Authority; as, 1. Every Biſhop having the chief Power in his own Dioceſs, though he is bound

bound by the Laws of Catholick Communion, and in order to preſerve the Peace and Unity of the Epiſcopacy, to conſent with his Colleagues in all wholſome Conſtitutions, and Rules of Diſcipline and Government; yet he cannot be impoſed on againſt his own Conſent by any Biſhop or Council of Biſhops, nor can juſtly be depoſed upon ſuch Accounts, while he neither corrupts the Faith, nor Schiſmatically divides the Church.† Cap. 4.

† The Authority how reserved refers not to the Decrees of Councils abt Faith or Manners, but only an Authority of censuring Heretical & Schismatical Bpps. Sherlock's Vind. of some Protest. Principles 4°. 1688. p. 26, &c

2. Nor can any Biſhop or Biſhops reſcind any Cenſures juſtly paſſed by another Biſhop againſt any in his own Church, or receive Appeals about ſuch Matters, without his Conſent; for the Unity of the Epiſcopacy requires all Biſhops to leave each other to the free Exerciſe of their Power and Authority in their own Churches, as we ſee the Church of *Rome* acknowledged in the Caſe of *Marcion*'s Appeal from his Fathers Sentence: For it is an uſurpation on the Authority of Biſhops, not to ſuffer them to govern their own Flock, while nothing is done to the injury of the Faith, and the Churches Peace; and nothing is more likely to make infinite diviſions and quarrels between Biſhops, than

Cap. 4. than for one Biſhop to undo, what another has done, or to judge over again that Cauſe, which has been already judged and determined, where it ought to be judged; as St. *Cyprian* tells *Cornelius* in the Caſe of *Feliciſſimus* and *Fortunatus*, as I obſerved above: I grant this is generally practiſed in Archiepiſcopal and National Churches, and in many Caſes there is great uſe and reaſon for it; but then this is not without the Conſent of other Biſhops; thoſe Appeals are allowed and confirmed by Provincial and National Synods, to which every Biſhop gives his Conſent, but I am now conſidering what the original Right of Biſhops is, not how far they may part with this Power for a more general good.

153

3. As every Biſhop has the chief Authority in his own Dioceſs, ſo much more has a larger Combination of Biſhops into a National Church, the ſupreme Power within it ſelf, from whence lies no Appeal to any Forraign Church, without its own Conſent.

The Unity of the Epiſcopacy requires the Union of neighbour Biſhops for one Government; but becauſe all the Biſhops in the World, though they are of the

the ſame Communion, yet cannot be u- Cap. 4.
nited into one Government, it is neceſſary to ſtop ſomewhere, and that which in all reaſon muſt determine the bounds of ſuch a Church, muſt be a convenient diſtance of place, or one Nation, and one Civil Government, ſuch Churches being more eaſily confederated into one Body, than thoſe of different Nations. Now if every Biſhop be the ſupreme Governor of his own Church, much more has a National Church the ſupreme Power of governing it ſelf.

A National Church is bound to maintain Catholick Communion with Neighbour Churches, and if it fall into Hereſie or Schiſm, Neighbour Churches may and ought to admoniſh and cenſure them; and if they continue obſtinate to withdraw Communion from them; but while a National Church preſerves the Unity of the Faith, and Catholick Communion, no other Church can intermeddle in its Government, nor ought to receive any Appeals from its Judgment; for no Biſhops or Churches have any Authority over each other, but only in order to Catholick Communion.

Theſe

Cap. 4. Theſe things I have diſcourſed more largely on purpoſe, if it be poſſible to prevent the miſtakes of theſe men, who are ſo unwilling to ſee or to acknowledge the Truth; and I hope I may ſafely conclude from the whole, that there is no danger, that the Biſhop of *Rome* or *Alexandria* ſhould challenge any juriſdiction over the Church of *England*, by vertue of the original Right and Power of the Catholick Biſhops in relation to the whole Church of Chriſt.

But however Mr. *Lob* is reſolved to make ſomething of it at laſt, and if he cannot prove, that I ſubject the Church of *England* to any Forraign Biſhop, yet it is plain, that I ſubject it to a general Council; for he ſays, *I aſſert, that if any Biſhops abuſe their Power, they are accountable to a general Council, that is, unto a Forraign Power, whereby he doth his utmoſt, to tear up the Church of* England *by the Roots, to ſubvert his Majeſties Supremacy, as if all the Laws of the Land concerning it, had not been of any force, all this by Dr.* Stillingfleet's *Defender.* Good man! What a happy Reformation is here! How is he now concerned for the Church of *England*, his Majeſties Supremacy, the Sacredneſs of

Reply, p. 29.

Ci-

Civil Laws in Religious Matters, and the Reputation of Dr. *Stillingfleet*; which ſuffers by ſuch a Defender! Cap. 4.

But where do I ſay, *That if any Biſhops abuſe their Power, they are accountable to a general Council*? Truly no where, but he tranſcribes a long Paragraph out of the Defence, againſt the abſolute independency of Biſhops, wherein there is this Expreſſion, *And 'tis very wild to imagine, that any of theſe Perſons, who abuſe their Power, ſhould not be accountable to the reſt for it.* i. e. *to the Colledge of Biſhops*; which laſt words are not mine, but his own Comment, though Printed in a different Character, as if they were mine; and this *Colledge of Biſhops* he transforms preſently into a general Council, and thus I ſubject the Arch-biſhop of *Canterbury*, whom I firſt equal to other Biſhops (as I do indeed with reſpect to original Right and Power, wherein all Biſhops are equal, not with reſpect to Church-conſtitutions) *to ſome Court above any in this Realm, to a general Council, a Colledge of Biſhops*, and now I am in danger again of a Præmunire.

But this has been already ſufficiently explained, in what ſenſe I deny the In-

Cap. 4. dependency of Biſhops, and how far this is from ſubjecting them to any Forraign Juriſdiction, whether of Forraign Prelates, or a general Council, though I cannot well underſtand, how a general Council, of which they themſelves are part, can be properly called a Forraign Court, or Forraign Juriſdiction; unleſs the Treaty at *Nimengen* were a Forraign Juriſdiction to all thoſe Princes and States, who ſent their Plenipotentiaries thither to act for them.

However to ſatisfie Mr. *Lob*, I ſhall 1. freely declare my thoughts about a general Council. 2. Conſider the folly of that ſuggeſtion, that to aſſert the Authority of a general Council, ſubverts the Kings ſupremacy, and incurs a Præmunire.

1. As for a general Council, my thoughts are theſe, which I humbly ſubmit to my Superiors. 1. That there never was, nor ever can be in a ſtrict ſenſe, a general and œcumenical Council of the whole Church, unleſs the Council of the Apoſtles at *Jeruſalem*, was ſuch; which yet was not general, unleſs all the Apoſtles were there, which I ſuppoſe will not be eaſily proved; for it is not likely there ever ſhould be a Convention

on of Biſhops from all parts of the Chriſtian World, nor if it were poſſible, that there ſhould be ſome few Biſhops diſpatcht from all Chriſtian Churches all the World over, can I ſee any reaſon, why this ſhould be called a general Council, when it may be, there are ten times as many Biſhops, who did not come to the Council, as thoſe who did; and why ſhould the leſs Number of Biſhops aſſembled in Council, judge for all the reſt, who ſo far exceed them in Numbers, and it may be are not inferior to them in Piety and Wiſdom: Eſpecially conſidering that every Biſhop has the ſupreme Government of his own Church, and his Liberty and Power to chooſe for himſelf, as St. *Cyprian* tells us; and muſt not be compelled to obedience by any of his Colleagues, which overthrows the proper Juriſdiction of general Councils, which can have no direct Authority over any Biſhops, who refuſe to conſent, unleſs it be in ſuch Matters as concern the purity of Faith and Manners, or Catholick Unity; in other Matters if St. *Cyprians* principle be true,

Cap. 4.

Neq; enim quiſquam noſtrum Epiſcopum ſe eſſe Epiſcoporum conſtituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obſequendi neceſſitatem collegas ſuos adigit, quando habeat omnis epiſcopus pro licentia libertatis & poteſtatis ſuæ arbitrium proprium ——*Cypr. præf. ad Concil. Carthag.*

Cap. 4. true, the major Number of Votes in Council cannot make a firm Decree, much leſs can the Votes of three or four hundred Biſhops give Laws to all the Biſhops in the Chriſtian Church, which is a plain Demonſtration, that a general Council cannot be the ſupreme Conſtitutive Regent Head of the Catholick Church.

2. Since every Biſhop from the Unity of Epiſcopacy, and his obligations to Catholick Communion is bound, as far as he can, to govern his particular Church by the mutual Counſel and Conſent of his Colleagues, we muſt acknowledg, that both Provincial and General Councils are of very great uſe, though they have no proper juriſdiction; and whatever Biſhop ſhould wilfully refuſe to obſerve the Decrees and Canons of ſuch Councils, without manifeſt neceſſity for not doing it, would be guilty of ſuch pride and obſtinacy, as would fall very little ſhort of the Guilt of Schiſm, when there is a juſt Reaſon for it; we may ſay with St. *Auſtin*, we do not conſent to this Council, but yet keep the Peace and Unity of the Church intire, and will not heighten every diſſent into a Schiſm; but where there is no ſuch rea-

Non conſentimus huic concilio, ſalvo jure unitatis. Aug. de baptiſmo l. 7. c. 25.

reaſon, it is no better than Schiſmatical pride and peeviſhneſs for any Biſhop to purſue his own humour, in oppoſition to the Decrees and Conſtitutions of his Colleagues; for the very Conſent and Agreement of Biſhops among themſelves is ſo great a good to the Church of God, that That alone is ſufficient to determine a good man, when there are not very weighty reaſons againſt it. Cap. 4.

St. *Cyprian*, I am ſure, thought it a Matter of mighty Conſequence to manage all the great Affairs of the Church by mutual Advice, in his Letter to the Presbyters and Deacons at *Rome*, written after the Death of *Fabian*, during the vacancy of that See, he tells them, that both mutual Love and Charity, and the reaſon of the thing required, that he ſhould conceal nothing from them of the Affairs of his Church; that ſo they might adviſe and conſult with each other, concerning the moſt uſeful Rules of Eccleſiaſtical Adminiſtrations. And therefore he tells us, that he put off the Conſideration of the State of the Lapſed, and would not innovate any thing in the

Et dilectio communis & ratio expoſcit, fratres chariſſimi, nihil conſcientiæ veſtræ ſubtrahere de his quæ apud nos geruntur, ut ſit nobis circa utilitatem eccleſiaſticæ adminiſtrationis communi conſilium. Cyp. ep. 29.

Cap. 4. Cypr. ep. 40. ancient Rules of Diſcipline, till God ſhould be pleaſed to reſtore Peace to the Church, that they might meet together for common Advice. And the *Roman* Presbyters in anſwer to another Letter of St. *Cyprians*, approve of this reſolution, and add a very weighty Reaſon for it, that it is impoſſible that Decree ſhould be firm, and obtain a general Complyance, which is not made by the Conſent of many: And therefore ep. 31. I obſerved in the Defence, that though they had no ſuch thing as a general Council, before the times of *Conſtantine*, yet they had frequent Provincial Councils, and ſent their Synodical Letters to Forraign Churches, with an account of their Tranſactions and Decrees, that they might either approve them in their Councils, or give them an account of their Diſſent, and the Reaſons of it.

Mr. *Baxter* asks me, whether they ſent theſe Letters all the World over; and I anſwer, I believe they did not, becauſe I ſuſpect it is not to be done; no more than a general Council can be convened from all parts of the World; but yet it is evident, this Communication by Letters was ſo general, that St. *Cyprian* and *Optatus* found the Conſent of

Cum quo nobis totus orbis commercio formatarum in una communionis ſocietate concordat Opt. lib. 2.

of the whole Church upon it: However half the World, or all the known famous Churches were ſufficient for Advice and Counſel, though not for ſupreme uncontroulable Government, which I never aſſerted; to adviſe with all the known Churches, which were within the reach of ſuch Communication, is ſufficient to ſatisfie us, how neceſſary they thought it, to uſe the moſt effectual Means they could to preſerve Catholick Communion; and that they believed mutual Advice and Counſel a very proper means for that end, and the Duty of all true Catholick Biſhops. Cap. 4.

This way St. *Auſtin* calls an *Epiſtolare Colloquium*, a Conference by Letters, which he thinks is not to be compared with the *Plenarium Concilium*, as he very properly calls a general Council, a full or plenary Council, which is made up of wiſe and learned Prelates from diſtant parts of the World. For when the Biſhops of ſo many ſeveral Churches, who may be well preſumed to know the Judgment and Practiſe of their own Churches, meet together without any private or factious Deſigns, freely to debate and conſult for the publick good of the Church, the Authority of ſuch a *Aug. de baptiſmo. l. 3. cap. 2.*

Cap. 4. Council muſt needs be venerable, and it muſt be ſome very great reaſon, that will juſtifie a diſſent from it.

Article 21. Such Councils indeed are not infallible, as our Church aſſerts, becauſe they conſiſt of fallible men, who may be, and have been deceived; and therefore in Matters neceſſary to Salvation, we muſt believe them no farther, than they agree with the holy Scriptures; though a modeſt man will not oppoſe his private judgment to the Decrees of a general Council, unleſs the Authority of the Scripture be very expreſly againſt it; but in Rules of Diſcipline and Government their Authority is greater ſtill, becauſe the Canons of general Councils are a great Medium, and excellent Inſtrument of Catholick Communion, the promoting of which is the principal end and the greateſt uſe of general Councils; and therefore though they do not command by any direct Authority, and ſuperior Juriſdiction, yet they ſtrongly oblige in order to ſerve the ends of Catholick Communion.

2. But now, ſuppoſe a man ſhould aſſert the Authority of a general Council, how does this ſubvert the Kings Supremacy, or incur a Premunire? For let

let the Authority of a general Council be what it will, it is wholly Spiritual, as the whole Government of the Church is, conſidered meerly as a Church or Spiritual Society; but the Supremacy of the King is an external and civil Juriſdiction in all Cauſes, and over all Perſons Eccleſiaſtical, within his Dominions; and Mr. *Lob* might as well ſay, that every man, who ſets up any ſpiritual Authority in the Church, ſubverts the Supremacy of the King; and thus the King's Supremacy makes him a Biſhop and a Prieſt too, a Scandal which Mr. *Lob*'s Predeceſſors raiſed in Queen *Elizabeths* days, to diſſwade People from the Oath of Supremacy, which it ſeems they were not then ſo fond of, and which the Queen confutes in her Injunctions, and tells her Subjects, that *ſhe neither doth, nor ever will, challenge any other Authority*, but only this, *under God to have the Soveraignty and Rule over all manner of Perſons, born within theſe her Realms, Dominions, and Countries, of what Eſtate, either Eccleſiaſtical or Temporal ſoever they be, ſo as no other Forraign Power ſhall or ought to have any Superiority over them.* Cap. 4.

When

Cap. 4. When Biſhop *Jewel* writ his Apology and Defence to *Scipio*, a Patrician of *Venice*, who complained of the *Engliſh* Nation for not ſending their Legates to the Council of *Trent*, he never thought of this reaſon againſt it, that it was contrary to the King's Supremacy, which is owned and confirmed by the Laws of this Land; and we may obſerve that the Statutes of Proviſors, and ſeveral Laws to preſerve the Liberties of the Realm from the Uſurpations of the Pope of *Rome*, or any other Forraign Potentate, were made and confirmed in ſeveral Kings Reigns, long before *Henry* the *8th*, a particular Account of which the Reader may find in Dr. *Burnet*'s Hiſtory of the Reformation, part 1. Book 2. p. 107. *&c.* upon which the Clergy were convicted in a Præmunire by King *Henry* the *8th*. and therefore Arch-biſhop *Bramhall* truly obſerves, That the Supremacy was not a new Authority uſurped by that King, but the ancient Right of the Imperial Crown of *England*; and yet in thoſe days it was not deemed a Subverſion of the Supremacy, to acknowledge the Authority of general Councils. For after the Statutes of Proviſors, we find the *Engliſh* Biſhops in

Bramhall's vindication of the Church of England.

in the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, which aſſerted the Authority of general Councils as high, as ever any men did. Cap. 4.

For indeed, ſince Princes have embraced the Chriſtian Faith, no Biſhops, excepting the Pope of *Rome*, have pretended to call a general Council, but by the Will and Authority of the Prince, nor can the Decrees and Canons of any Council be received in any Kingdom, or obtain the Authority of Laws, but by the Conſent of the Prince, which therefore certainly can be no encroachment upon his Supremacy: While the King has the ſupreme executive Power in all Cauſes, and over all Perſons in his own Hands, the ſpiritual Power and Authority of the Church is no invaſion of his Rights.

This is ſufficient at preſent, in anſwer to Mr. *Lob*'s inſinuation, that to aſſert the Authority of general Councils, ſubverts the Kings Supremacy, ſubjects the Church of *England* to a Forraign Court and Juriſdiction, and thereby incurs the Penalty of a Præmunire; whereby we ſee, that he underſtands the Law as little, as he does the Goſpel, only ſhews his good Will to poor *Caſſandrians*, and as much as he declames againſt penal Laws

Cap. 4. Laws againſt Diſſenters, would be glad to ſee the Church of *England* once more under the Execution of a Præmunire.

4. Mr. *Lob* has not done with me yet, but to make me a perfect *Caſſandrian*, whether I will or not, he adds as my ſenſe, *That this Council of Forraign Biſhops, unto which they* (i.e. the Biſhops of the Church of *England*) *are accountable, muſt look on the Biſhop of* Rome, *as their Primate; the Primacy of the Biſhop of* Rome *being acknowledged, it ſeems, by our Author himſelf, as well as by* Bramhall. *The Primacy* (*he ſaith*) *out of* Cyprian, *being given to* Peter, *that it might appear, that the Church of Chriſt was one, and the Chair, that is, the Apoſtolical Office and Power is one. Thus* Cyprian, *on whom lay all the Care of the Churches, diſpatches Letters to* Rome, *from whence they were ſent through all the Catholick Churches; all this is to be found from* p. 208. *to the end of the Chapter.*

Reply, p. 12.

This is a terrible Charge indeed, and home to the Purpoſe, and Mr. *Lob* is a terrible Adverſary in theſe days, if he can but Swear, as well as he can Write; for all this is Forgery and Villany, as any man may ſatisfie himſelf, who will be

be at the Pains to peruſe that part of the Defence, he directs to; where I am ſo far from aſſerting the Primacy of St. *Peter* over all Biſhops, that I do expreſly vindicate that paſſage of St. *Cyprian*, which the Flatterers of the Pope alledge for this Primacy, from ſignifying any ſuch thing; and for the Satisfaction of all indifferent Readers, what Credit is to be given to Mr. *Lob*, I will tranſcribe the whole Paſſage, though it be ſomewhat long, as a ſufficient Confutation of this Calumny, and it is this. Cap. 4.

"And in his (*Cyprian*'s) Book of the "Unity of the Church, the firſt Argu- "ment he uſes to prove the Unity of "the Church, is the Unity of the Apo- "ſtolical Office (and what that means, I have already ſufficiently explained) "and aſſigns this as the reaſon, why our "Saviour, in a particular Manner, com- "mitted the Keys to *Peter* (when he "gave the ſame Power to all the reſt of "the Apoſtles, which he did to *Peter*) "*viz.* to manifeſt the Unity of the Apo- "ſtolical Office and Power, that *there is* "*but one Chair, and one original of Uni-* "*ty, which begins in one; for the reſt of* "*the Apoſtles were the ſame, that* Peter "*was, had an equal ſhare in the Honour* "*and* *Def. p. 209.*

Cap. 4. " *and Power of the Apoſtolical Office;*
" *but the beginning is from Unity, and*
" *the Primacy is given to* Peter, *that it*
" *might appear, that the Church of Chriſt*
" *is one, and the Chair one,* i. e. *the Apo-*
" *ſtolical Office and Power; they are all*
" *Paſtors, but there is but one Flock,*
" *which is fed by all the Apoſtles with a*
" *joynt Conſent.*

" This is the plain Scope and Deſign
" of this Paſſage of St. *Cyprian* (which
" has been ſo often abuſed, eſpecially by
" the *Romaniſts*) that our Saviour in
" naming *Peter* only, in giving the Apo-
" ſtolical Power, did ſignifie, that the
" Apoſtolical Office, though exerciſed
" by ſeveral Perſons, is but one Office
" and Power, which is not ſo properly
" divided among the Apoſtles, as admi-
" niſtred by a joynt Conſent; and
" therefore giving this Power to one
" Apoſtle, included the beſtowing this
" Power on the whole Apoſtolical Col-
" ledge.

" And therefore, when St. *Cyprian*
" ſays, that Chriſt built his Church upon
" *Peter*, he does not, and cannot mean,
" the Perſon of *Peter*, or any thing pe-
" culiar to him, but that Apoſtolical
" Office and Power, which was given

" to

" to the Colledge of the Apoſtles in the Cap. 4.
" Name of *Peter*, as the Church is ſaid
" to be built upon the Foundation of
" the Apoſtles and Prophets. And when
" he ſays, that Chriſt gave the Primacy
" to *Peter*, and yet at the ſame time af-
" firms, that the other Apoſtles were
" equal ſharers with him in Honour and
" Power, and were all that, which *Pe-*
" *ter* was, it can ſignifie no more, nor
" no leſs, than that Chriſt named *Peter*
" firſt, or rather in ſtead of all the Apo-
" ſtles, thereby to inſtruct them, that
" though they were many, yet their Of-
" fice and Power was but one, which
" they muſt exerciſe as one man with
" one Conſent. This I ſuppoſe is ſuffici-
ent to ſatisfie any man, how far I am
from aſcribing to *Peter* a Primacy over
all the Apoſtles, much leſs to the Pope
over all Biſhops, as *Peter's* Succeſſor.

And this is all I can find, that either Mr. *Lob* or Mr. *B.* urges to prove me engaged in a *Caſſandrian* deſign; but now for the Contradictions I am charged with. Mr. *Baxter* ſays, *Dr.* Sherlock *(if he be Dr.* Stillingfleets *Defender)* which I think, is not very material to this Controverſie, whether he be, or not, *ſaith and unſaith, and would verifie*

Anſwer to Dr. *Sherlock.* p. 202.

Contra-

Cap. 4. *Contradictions. He muſt write us a new Dictionary, to tell us, in what Senſe he takes common words, before he can be underſtood. He defendeth Dr.* Stillingfleet's *denial of any political, conſtitutive, ſupreme Power, and yet maintaineth that the whole Church hath one Regent part, which all muſt obey, that will be Members.* This I confeſs, is a Contradiction, for if the whole Church hath *one Regent Part*, it muſt have a conſtitutive Regent Head. This he ſays, I affirm, but he could not tell where, and therefore never pretends to cite my words for it. *But* (as he goes on) *he will not grant, that every Political body muſt have a conſtitutive Regent Head; and yet he doth but ſay* (*if we deny this*) *as if he could not, or durſt not tell, what he grants, or denies; yet he grants that* (*every Political body conſiſts of a* Pars Imperans *and* Subdita) *and that Church Governors united and governing by Conſent are the* Pars Imperans, *and Chriſtian People the* Pars Subdita) *but ſaith he* (*all this is true without a conſtitutive Regent Head*) *can you tell how his aſſerted, and his denyed Propoſitions differ?* 1. *It is not a Regent part he denyeth.* 2. *It is not, that this Regent part is one to the whole Body, the*

the Church. For if it were that, he would not ſo zealouſly contradict and condemn us, that ſay the ſame thing as he. And here Mr. *B.* himſelf has unriddled this whole Myſtery of Contradictions, though he was not willing to underſtand it, becauſe then he had had nothing to object. I deny, that there is one conſtitutive Regent Head, either of a National, or the Univerſal Church, but yet affirm, that there is a Government in the Church, and conſequently, that there is a governing and a governed Part, that the Biſhops are the Governors of the Church, and the Chriſtian People, thoſe who are governed; now I thought Mr. *B.* without a new Dictionary (unleſs it be a Dictionary to teach common ſenſe, which indeed would be the beſt Cure in the World for Fanaticiſm) might have underſtood, that when I denyed, that there is any one conſtitutive Regent Head of the Church, and at the ſame time aſſerted, that the Biſhops are the Regent and governing part of the Church, I could not mean, that the Biſhops were the Governors of the Church, as united into one Common Regent Head over the whole Church, but they were Governors of the Catho- C 1p. 4.

Cap. 4.

lick Church, as every Biſhop governed his own ſhare and portion of it, as committed to his Charge.

This was the State of the Controverſie between Mr. *B.* and the Dr. Mr. *Baxter* will not allow a National Church, to be one political Body and Society, unleſs it have one conſtitutive Regent Head, for he ſays, *many Churches aſſociated for mutual Help and Concord, are but in a looſe ſenſe called a Church, not in a political Senſe, but equivocally ſo called; and that the Eccleſiaſtical Government of the particular Churches ſeverally, makes it no Church, but an aſſociation of many Churches.*

The ſecond true Defence in anſwer to Dr. *Still.* p. 112.

But the Reader will be the better able to judge of this Diſpute, if I briefly explain the true Reaſon of all this zeal for *one conſtitutive Regent Head* of the Church, which I perceive very few People underſtand; for indeed it is a Myſtery but lately diſcovered by Mr. *Baxter*, and earneſtly eſpouſed by Mr. *Humphry*, to juſtifie all the Schiſms and Separations in the World, and to make all the diſtinct and ſeparate Communions in a Nation, one National Church, and all the ſeparate Churches in the World, one Catholick Church.

For

For, 1. they aſſert, that a particular Congregation aſſociated for local preſential Communion under a fixed Paſtor, is the only Church of Divine inſtitution, which I have at large confuted in the 5 and 6 Chapters of the Defence, and none of my Adverſaries have been ſo hardy yet, as to attempt the leaſt Reply. Cap. 4.

2. That all theſe ſingle Churches all the World over become one Catholick Church, not by any Union among themſelves, but by being all united in Chriſt, who is the ſupreme Regent conſtitutive Head of the Catholick Church; there is no need they ſhould be all united to one another, to make one Catholick Church, ſo they be all united to Chriſt, the Head of the Church. Of which I have diſcourſed above in the ſecond Chapter of this Vindication.

3. It hence follows, that it is impoſſible to make one National Church upon pure Eccleſiaſtical Principles; for every one of theſe ſingle Churches with their particular Paſtors over them, are original Churches of Divine Inſtitution, and no one Church or Paſtor, has a ſuperior Power and Juriſdiction over the reſt; and therefore though particular

Cap. 4. Churches may voluntarily associate with each other for mutual Help and Concord, yet this cannot make them one Political organized Body or Church, but only a Church in a loose equivocal sense; for it is contrary to all the Maxims of Politie, that That should be called one Political Body, which has not one Political constitutive Regent Head, that is, one superior Power over the whole Body, either Monarchical, Aristocratical, or Democratical; and since Christ hath given no one Pastor or Bishop a superior Authority to govern the rest, which would make the Church a Monarchy, nor united all Pastors into one governing Head, which should govern the whole Church, and their own Members by a major Vote, which is an Aristocracy, nor erected a mixt Tribunal of Pastors and People, which is a Democracy, it is evident, that the several Churches and Pastors in a Nation, are not by divine Institution united under any one Ecclesiastical governing Head, and therefore cannot be one Political National Church; which makes it a fond thing to cry out of Schism and Separation, from the National Church of *England*, when there is, and can be no

no ſuch thing, in a proper Eccleſiaſtical ſenſe. Cap. 4.

4. And therefore the only Notion of a National Church, is all the Churches of a Nation united under the King, as the accidental Head of the Church, who is the ſupreme Head, and Governor of the Church in his Dominions. And thus the National Church of *England* has no other Foundation, but the Laws of the Land, and the Supremacy of the King; it is the Creature of the ſupreme Power, which made it, and may unmake it again, when it pleaſeth.

5. And therefore the moſt effectual way of uniting all Diſſenters, is not to enjoyn Conformity to any one Conſtitution, but to give a legal Eſtabliſhment to the different Sects and Parties among us, at leaſt to all thoſe, which are tolerable, which ſhall be under the Government of the King's Miniſters, whether Lay or Clergy, in Eccleſiaſtical affairs, and thus all the Diſſenters, which are now among us, as much as they diſſent from the preſent Conſtitution of the Church of *England*, and from each other, ſhall immediately become the Members of this accidental National Church

Cap. 4. Church of *England*, under the King as an accidental Head; and thus the Schism, which we so much complain of, is effectually cured, according to Mr. *Humphry*'s Materials for Union, which shall be particularly examined in their due place.

This is the plain account of this whole Intrigue, and that the impartial Reader may the better judge, where the Dispute lies between me and my Adversaries, I shall as plainly represent in one view a Scheme of my Principles, upon which I oppose this.

As 1. That Christ hath but one Church, which we call the Catholick Church, and is antecedent in order of Nature before particular Congregational Churches, which are Churches not considered as independent Congregations, but as Members of the Catholick Church, which I proved at large in the 3*d.* Chapter of the Defence, and the 1*st.* Chap. of this Vindication.

2. That all the Churches in the World are one Catholick Church, as united in one Catholick Communion; as I have proved in the 4*th.* Chapter of the Defence, and the 2*d.* Chapter of this Vindication.

3. That

Cap. 4.

3. That the Church is a Society under Government, has a governing and a governed Part; that the Biſhops are the Governors of the Church, and Chriſtian People, thoſe who are governed.

4. That all Biſhops are originally of equal Power, and that every Biſhop is ſupreme in his own Dioceſs.

5. That yet all Biſhops and Churches are bound to live in Catholick Communion with each other, that is, as Members of the ſame great Body, the Catholick Church, and every Biſhop, as far as poſſibly he can, muſt govern his particular Church and Dioceſs, by the mutual Advice and Conſent of neighbour Biſhops.

6. That this is the Foundation of thoſe greater Combinations of Churches, conſidered as Churches, or pure Eccleſiaſtical Societies, into Archiepiſcopal, Metropolitical, or National Churches, which ſignifies no more than the voluntary Combination of ſuch Biſhops and Churches into a ſtricter Aſſociation, for the better Preſervation of one Communion, by mutual Advice and Counſel, Concord and Agreement, in Worſhip, Diſcipline, and Government.

Cap. 4. 7. That for the preſervation of Peace and Order in this united Body or Confederation of neighbour Churches, one or more Biſhops may by a general Conſent be intruſted with a ſuperior Power of calling Synods, receiving Appeals, and exerciſing ſome peculiar Acts of Diſcipline, under the Regulation of Eccleſiaſtical Canons; which is the Power now aſcribed to Arch-biſhops and Metropolitans.

8. That yet there cannot be one conſtitutive Eccleſiaſtical Regent Head in a National, much leſs in the Univerſal Church; not Monarchical, becauſe no one Biſhop has an original Right to govern the reſt in any Nation, and therefore whatever Power may be granted him by Conſent, yet it is not eſſential to the Being or Unity of the Church, which is one, not by being united under one ſuperior governing Power, but by living in one Communion; not Ariſtocratical, becauſe every Biſhop being ſupreme in his own Dioceſs, and accountable to Chriſt for his Government, cannot and ought not ſo wholly to diveſt himſelf of this Power, as to be in all Caſes neceſſarily determined and over-ruled by the Major Vote, contrary to his own

own Judgment and Conſcience; he is always bound to live in Chriſtian Communion with his Colleagues, while they do not violate the Terms of Catholick Communion; and as far as poſſibly he can, he muſt comply with their Decrees to preſerve Peace and Order; but if they ſhould decree any thing, which he judges prejudicial to his Church, he is bound not to comply with them; becauſe the chief Care of his Church is committed to him, and he cannot ſo intirely give away the Government of it to others. From whence it appears, that all the Biſhops in a Nation, much leſs all the Biſhops in the World, cannot unite into ſuch a Colledge, as ſhall by a ſupreme Authority, govern all Biſhops and Churches by a Major Vote, which is the Form of Ariſtocratical Government: And for the ſame Reaſon a National Church conſidered as a Church, cannot be under the government of a Democratical Head, for if the Colledge of Biſhops have not this Power, much leſs has a mixt Colledge of Biſhops and People. Cap. 4.

Let any impartial Reader now judge, wherein I contradict my ſelf in this Scheme of Church Government: I acknow-

Cap. 4. knowledge the Church to be a governed Society, to have a *pars Imperans & Subdita*; for every Biſhop is the Governor of his own Church, and thus the whole Church is governed by parts. I deny, that there is any one conſtitutive Regent Head of a National or Univerſal Church; becauſe every Biſhop is the ſupreme Governor of his Church, and cannot ſo abſolutely part with his original Right to any Biſhop, or Colledge of Biſhops, as to oblige himſelf to govern his Church by their Order and Direction, though contrary to his own Judgment and Conſcience; but yet the Epiſcopacy is one, becauſe all Biſhops have the ſame Power, and are bound to live in the ſame Communion, and to govern their ſeveral Churches by mutual Advice and Conſent; and in order to this, may unite themſelves in ſtricter Aſſociations and Confederacies, under ſuch Rules of Government, as do not encroach upon the unalienable Rights and Power of the Epiſcopacy: And this is ſufficient to make them one Church, for if the Catholick Church be one by one Catholick Communion, why may not the National Church be one, by one Communion? And thoſe guilty of Schiſm, who ſe-

ſeparate without juſt Cauſe from ſuch a National Union of Churches, though it were not backt by any Civil Authority or humane Laws? Cap. 4.

And now I doubt not, but every intelligent Reader, will think it needleſs to give a particular Anſwer to the cavilling Objections of Mr. *Baxter* and Mr. *Humphrey*, but I muſt beg his patience (for the ſake of others, who are very unwilling to underſtand theſe Matters) while I particularly apply, what I have now diſcourſed, in Anſwer to them; being aſhamed, that I am forced to prevent ſuch wilful or ignorant Miſtakes, by ſo frequent a Repetition of the ſame things; but I conſider, it is better to do this effectually once, than to be obliged to write, as often as theſe men can ſpit Books.

The original Diſpute was concerning *the conſtitutive Regent Head of the Church of* England; in Anſwer to which Queſtion, who is the conſtitutive Regent Head of the Church of *England*, I 1. diſtinguiſhed between a National Church, conſidered as a Church, and as incorporated into the State, and 2. reinforced the Deans Anſwer to this Queſtion; and though I know not any one

Cap. 4. one thing, that need be added to what I have already Diſcourſed in the *7th.* Chapter of the Defence, yet this being the Chief, and almoſt only Place my Adverſaries have thought fit to fix on, to ſhew their great Abilities, I ſhall briefly review this Diſpute in the ſame Method, which I before obſerved, that I may not confound my Readers with altering the ſtate of the Queſtion.

Defence, P. 558. *I diſtinguiſh between a National Church, conſidered as a Church, and as a Church incorporated with the State*; this Mr. *H.* ſays, *is no good diſtinction, becauſe the Church is National only under the laſt Conſideration*, i. e. as incorporated with the State. *The Church of Chriſt conſidered in its ſelf, is either Univerſal or Particular, but it muſt be conſidered as incorporated in the State, to make it National.* Now this is ſaid without any Reaſon, and therefore might be as well denyed, without aſſigning any Reaſon for ſuch a Denyal; but to ſatisfie Mr. *H.* in this Point, I anſwer.

Reply, P. 130.

That the Church, conſidered as a Church, is not neceſſarily conſidered, either as Univerſal or Particular. The eſſential Notion of a Chriſtian Church, is a Body or Society of men confederated

rated in the Faith, and for the Worſhip of Chriſt under ſuch Church Officers, as he hath appointed: That this Church is Univerſal, is founded on the Laws of Catholick Communion, which unites all particular Societies of Chriſtians into one Body; that it is divided into particular Churches, is owing to the Neceſſity of things, for ſince all Chriſtians in remote and diſtant places of the World, cannot all worſhip God together, nor live under the Care and Government of one Biſhop, this makes it neceſſary, that the Epiſcopal Office and Power be divided into many hands, and the Multitude of Chriſtians divided into many particular Churches, under their proper Paſtors, but in the ſame Communion. Cap. 4.

Now if Catholick Communion makes all the Churches in the World, one univerſal Catholick Church, and a particular Communion, makes a particular Church, why does not a National Church-Communion make one National Church? A Church is a Church, conſidered as a Religious Body and Society of Chriſtians, as I have now deſcribed it, but it is Univerſal, National, or Particular, from the different degrees and kinds of Communion, and therefore Churches joyned

in

Cap. 4. in National Communion are properly called a National Church, though there were no Christian Prince to head it.

And that a National Church is of a distinct Consideration, as it is a Church, and as incorporated with the State, I proved in the Defence from this Topick,

p. 558. that *de facto, there have been, and may be still, National Churches, when the Prince and great numbers of the People are not Christians. For Patriarchal and Metropolitan combinations of Churches, are of the same Nature with what we call National Churches, and such there were in the times of* Paganism *under Heathen and persecuting Emperors.* To which Mr. *H.* Answers, *A Patriarchal Church, and a Metropolitan Church, is not a Church National. A Patriarchate may contain in it the Churches of many Nations; A Metropolitan but half the Christians of one, and so the one is too bigg, and the other too little to be a National Church, and a Dioceſan much leſs:* But what is this to the Purpose? Can Mr. *H.* prove, that a Patriarchate must of necessity be always larger, and a Metropolitan Church always less than a Nation? Might not a National Synod before the Conversion of Princes to the Christian Faith have

set

ſet up a Patriarch, or Metropolitan over themſelves? and may not the Kings of *England*, *France*, and *Spain*, do ſo ſtill, if they pleaſe? And yet I did not ſay, that a Patriarchal or Metropolitan Church, was a National Church, but of the ſame Nature with a National Church, that is, they were a voluntary Combination of Churches, founded on the Laws of Catholick Communion, antecedent to any civil Conjunction, by the Laws and Authority of Princes; and I would fain know any Reaſon, why all the Chriſtian Churches in a Nation may not thus unite, and why Churches thus united, may not be called a National Church, though they were not Confirmed and Eſtabliſht by humane Laws; though the Prince, and great part of his Subjects, were Infidels, Hereticks or Schiſmaticks. Cap. 4.

But Mr. *H.* obſerves, that I ſay, *I cannot tell, why it is accidental to the Church of Chriſt to be National, any more than to be Univerſal, or Patriarchal and Metropolitical, any more than Univerſal*, and Anſwers, *But when I tell him, that the Body of Chriſt (which is his Church) may ſubſiſt, though there were never a Patriarch, or Metropolitan in the Earth,* Reply, p. 131.

Cap. 4. *Earth; I hope, he can ſee (if he will) how the Conſideration of the Church, as Patriarchal or Metropolitical, and ſo National, muſt be accidental to it.* I am very willing to ſee any thing, I can; but I can ſee nothing here, but his Miſtake. That the Church cannot ſubſiſt without a Patriarch or Metropolitan. I never ſaid yet, nor does he produce any place where I have ſaid it, for what he ſays, are not my words, but his own Comment. All that I ſay is this, that the Aſſociation and Confederacy of neighbour Churches is founded on the Law of Catholick Communion, and that Catholick Communion cannot be maintained without it; that ſuch Combinations of Churches in ſeveral Nations and Provinces there were, long before there were any Chriſtian Princes, and may be ſo ſtill, though there were no Chriſtian Kings in the World, and therefore that a Church may be National, without being incorporated into the State.

It is true, ſince the firſt Records of Church-Hiſtory, theſe greater Combinations of Churches, have by mutual Conſent had a Patriarch, Primate, or Metropolitan ſet over them, and therefore we cannot ſpeak of theſe Churches in

in the Ancient Language, without calling them Patriarchal or Metropolitical Churches; but my Argument does not proceed upon the Union of Churches under a Patriarch or Metropolitan, but upon their Association for Advice and Councel, and Discipline, for the preservation of Catholick Communion. Cap. 4.

There may be such Associations without a Patriarch or Metropolitan; but the universal Church has always thought it most convenient to have one; and Mr. *H.* is greatly mistaken to think, that every thing, which is not essential to a Church, is accidental. There are a great many prudential Constitutions in Societies, which are of great use to the well-being of a Society, though not of absolute necessity to its being; and he would be thought a very mean Politician, who should call the Results of the best Reason and Consideration, and most mature advice for the publick Good, accidental Constitutions.

The Union of neighbour Churches for Worship, Discipline and Government, is not accidental to the Church, but the necessary Result of Catholick Communion, which is a binding Law to all Churches, and hereon I found a National

Cap. 4. tional Church; The Superiority and Juriſdiction of Patriarchs or Metropolitans, is not eſſential to the Church, but a ~~prelent~~ *prudent* Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, which ought not to be called Accidental, unleſs when they are the Reſults of Chance, or the Effects of Folly, Ignorance, and Raſhneſs, like Mr. *H*'s accidental National Church, patcht up of forty ſeparate Communions, united in an accidental Head; but this man, I perceive, is an *Epicurean* Divine, who makes the Church, as that Philoſopher did the World, by a fortuitous jumble of Atoms.

But at laſt, Mr. *H.* grants me all that I ask, with reference to National Churches; for to prove, *That the Union of all the Chriſtian Churches in a Nation into one Body and Society, is no more an accidental Conſideration of the Church, than the univerſal Church it ſelf is*, I obſerved, That *our Saviour gave Command to his Apoſtles to go teach all Nations, and to plant Churches in them, and therefore this was the Intention of our Saviour, that there ſhould be Churches in all Nations, as well as in all the World; and if all the Churches in the World muſt make but one Church, then certainly much more muſt all the*

Defence, p. 561.

Churches

Churches in a Nation be but one; which are in a nearer Capacity of Communion with each other, than the Churches of all the World are, and whereby Catholick Unity and Communion may be more easily preserved, than if all the Churches in a Nation were single and independent; there being a more easie correspondence between Nations, than between every Town and City in distant Nations. To this Mr. H. replies. *And as for Christs Command of planting Churches in the whole World, and so in Nations, and Cities and Towns, requiring Unity and Communion every where among Christians* (i. e. the Unity and Communion of one Body, for that is my meaning) *it may warrant the Combinations of Patriarchal, Metropolitical, National, Dioceſan, and Parochial Churches to this end* (*i. e.* to maintain one Catholick Communion) *if he pleaſe, provided only, that theſe Forms be held only accidental Forms, according to humane prudence, and not the Eſſential Form of the Church of Christ, according to divine Inſtitution.* But we are not a talking of Church-forms, but of Church-Communion. The Patriarchal or Metropolitical Church-form is an Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, though not therefore accidental,

Cap. 4.

Reply, p. 131.

Cap. 4.

tal, as I obſerved before; but Catholick Communion is a divine Inſtitution, and therefore the Combinations of Churches for Catholick Communion is divine alſo, though the particular Forms of ſuch Combinations may be regulated and determined by Eccleſiaſtical Prudence, which differs ſomewhat from what we call meer humane Prudence, becauſe it is not the Reſult of meer natural Reaſon, but founded on, and accommodated to a divine Inſtitution.

See the Defence, p. 258.

Now if Mr. *H.* will, as we ſee at laſt he does, own ſuch Combinations of Churches into one Body for Catholick Communion, according to our Saviours, that is, a divine Inſtitution, then we find a National Church antecedent to any humane Laws, and of a diſtinct Conſideration from a Church incorporated into the State. But after all, I wonder what Church-form Mr. *H.* will own to be of divine Inſtitution, ſince he ſays, that *Patriarchal, Metropolitical, National, Dioceſan, and Parochial Churches, muſt be held only accidental forms according to humane prudence*, there is no form left, that I know of, but an independent Church-form, to be of divine Inſtitution; and if Mr. *H.* will own this, fare-

farewell to Catholick Communion, for Independency in the very Nature of it, is a Schiſm, as I have proved in the Defence. Cap. 4. Def. p. 235.

There is one thing more Mr. *H.* ſays, which, becauſe it is very pleaſant, I reſerved to the laſt. Mr. *H.* proves a National Church, to be an accidental Conſideration of a Church, becauſe, that to the being of a National Church it is neceſſary, that all the People of the Nation ſhould be Chriſtians, and that the King ſhould be ſo alſo, both which are very accidental things, and therefore a National Church is an accidental Church, now I proved in the Defence, that neither of theſe was neceſſary to make a Church National; and all the Anſwer he gives to it, is this; *When we ſpeak of a National Church, our own is always to be underſtood, about which the Diſpute is and our Church is a National Political Church, no otherwiſe but upon this account* (that is, that the People and the Prince are Chriſtians) *and the Suppoſition hereof is neceſſary to it.* And a little after he tells us, *By a National Church we commonly underſtand* (*I apprehend*) *a Political Church, wherein all the particular Chriſtians and Churches in a Nati-* Reply, P. 130.

Cap. 4. *on, and thoſe only, are combined under the Government, through the ſupreme Magiſtrate, to Church-purpoſes.* This is ſuch a looſe deſcription of a National Church, as may ſerve almoſt any purpoſe; But the whole force of his Reaſoning is this, that the National Church of *England* (and ſo other National Churches under Chriſtian Princes) is incorporated into the State, *ergo*, it is a National Church, only as it is incorporated into the State, and the Suppoſition of this is neceſſary to make it a National Church; the laſt Reſult of which, is no more but this, *Bellarmine thou lieſt.* I had aſſerted and proved, that a National Church may be conſidered as a Church, and as incorporated into the State, in Anſwer to this; Mr. *H.* ſays, that the Church of *England* is a National Church, only as it is incorporated into the State, which is the thing he ought to have proved, but he thought it more convenient only to affirm it; how eaſie is it to anſwer Books, if bold denyals, or bold and naked Aſſertions may paſs for an anſwer?

Or does Mr. *H.* indeed think, that becauſe the Church of *England* is confirmed and eſtabliſhed by Civil Laws, and

and Sanctions, and humane Authority, therefore it can be conſidered as a Church upon no other account? May not the ſame thing be conſidered under different Reſpects and Relations? Or does he think with Mr. *Hobb*'s, that Chriſtianity it ſelf can be a Law to us, only conſidered as the Law of the Land, becauſe it is now made the Law of the Land? And if Chriſtian Religion as the Law and Inſtitution of Chriſt, be of a diſtinct Conſideration from its being the Law of the Land, ſo muſt the Chriſtian Church be too, the Inſtitution of which is a great part of the Chriſtian Religion, the Sacraments and Promiſes, the Remiſſion of ſins, and eternal Life being confined to the Communion of the Church; and the Laws of Princes can as well make a new Chriſtian Religion, as a new Chriſtian Church; and therefore a National Church muſt be diſtinctly conſidered as a Church, and as incorporated into the State, for no Civil Authority can make that to be a Church, which is not a Church, nor that to be one National Church, which is not one National Communion, one Communion being neceſſary to make any Church one, whether it be the Univerſal, Na- Cap. 4.

Cap. 4. tional, or particular Church. But of this more hereafter.

Having thus vindicated a National Church, and proved it to be a Church, before and after its incorporation into the State, the next inquiry is, whether a National Church be a Political Body or Society, now this Diſpute will quickly be at an end, if we do but recover the true State of the Controverſie: Mr. *B.* asked, what is the conſtitutive Regent Head of the Church of *England*? the Dean denyed, that there is any ſuch Head of the Church of *England* conſidered as a Church, though the King be the ſupreme Head and Governor of the Church, as it is incorporated into the State: Mr. *B.* replyes, that the Church muſt have ſuch a conſtitutive Regent Head, becauſe every political Society muſt have one conſtitutive Regent Head, or elſe it is not one Politie: to this I anſwered in the Defence of the Dean, that if the Church cannot be a Political Society without one conſtitutive Regent Head, then the Church is not a Political Society, for it neither has, nor can have any ſuch conſtitutive Regent Head on earth over the whole. That the Church is one, not by one ſuperior

perior Power over the whole, *an informing, ſpecifying, unifying, ſupreme Power*, as Mr. *B.* calls it, but by one Communion. Cap. 4.

Now Mr. *B.* in his Anſwer to me, inſtead of proving that the Church is ſuch a Political Society, as has one conſtitutive Regent Head, he produces his *Definition of* Politica, *and obſerves, that Politie is either a Civil or Eccleſiaſtical Commonwealth. That* Hooker *and many others entitle their Books of Eccleſiaſtical Politie*, and Spalatenſis's *learned Volumns are* de Republica Eccleſiaſtica. But what is this to the purpoſe? Does *Hooker* ſet up one conſtitutive Regent Head over the Church? Do any of them prove, that Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Politie is the ſame thing? Do not the Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Common-wealth differ as much, as the Church and the State? And therefore he muſt ſtill prove, that as one ſupreme Regent Head is neceſſary to the Unity of a State or Kingdom, ſo it is to the Unity of the Church; which will be a fair Advance towards Popery. And yet I find nothing like a Proof of this, but a down right Affirmation without any Proof, *That the Regent part, is the Informing* p. 184.

Cap. 4. *forming part; if it have not one Regent part, it is not one Society, as Political: If it have none, it is no Politie; if it have many, it is many.* This I grant is true of ſuch Societies, as are one by one ſupreme unifying Power; but it is not true of ſuch a Society, as is one, not by one ſupreme Power over the Whole, but by one Communion: And ſuch a Society the Church is, as I largely proved in the Defence, and therefore the Church muſt be excepted from Mr. *B*'s Rules and Definitions of Politie.

Ib. p. 203. In another place Mr. *B.* ſuſpects, that the Reaſon of my Oppoſition to a conſtitutive Regent Head, is, that I do not underſtand the Terms, and therefore he takes pains to inſtruct me, what a Regent Head ſignifies, and what Conſtitutive ſignifies. But he has as ill luck at gueſſing, as he has at reaſoning: For the quite contrary is true; I did underſtand the Terms, but did not like the Thing, and therefore oppoſed it.

But do I not know, *That Head is commonly taken for* Synonimal *with* ſumma poteſtas, or the ſupreme Power? Yes I do, and deny that there is ſuch a viſible Regent Head over a National Church, conſidered as a Church.

Or

Or do I not know, *That a conſtitutive Cauſe, in the common Sence of* Logicians, *ſignifieth the eſſentiating Cauſe, as diſtinct from the efficient and final.* Yes, I know this too well: *A Political Society either hath Matter and Form, or not. If yea, what is the Form, if not the Regent part in relation to the Body? Its ſpecies is the ſpecifying Form,* quæ dat eſſe & nomen, *and in exiſtence it is the unifying or individuating Form. But if it have no Form, it is nothing, and hath no name.* This is a formidable man at Metaphyſicks and Logick, and I do not wonder, he was ſo often too hard for Sr. *Matthew Hales,* (as he himſelf tells us, in his late additional remarks on the Life of that excellent Perſon, whoſe Name and Memory is Martyred by ſuch Hiſtorians) for I think, few men of underſtanding can deal with him. Cap. 4.

But the plain *Engliſh* of all theſe hard words, and Metaphyſical ſubtilty, is no more but this. That in every Society there is ſomething, which makes it ſuch a kind of Society, which in alluſion to Natural beings, he calls the Form of it. That a Political Body being a Society under one ſupreme Government, the ſupreme Power muſt be the Form of it, and

Cap. 4. and therefore the National Church being a Political Society, conſidered as a Church, muſt have a ſupreme conſtitutive Regent Head, as the Form of it. The reſult of which reaſoning is this, that if the Church be ſuch a Political Society, as has a ſupreme Regent Head on Earth (which I always denyed) then it muſt have a ſupreme Regent Head. Which if Mr. *B.* calls Diſputing and Proving, I ſuppoſe no body elſe will: But this will be better underſtood, by conſidering Mr. *B*'s Reaſons, to prove this ſupreme Regent Power to be the conſtitutive Form of the Church; which follow in the ſame place, and are theſe.

1. *If the* ſumma Poteſtas *of the Church be not the conſtitutive Form, then the Church is not a Society univocally ſo called, as all other Political Societies are, but is Equivocally called a Polity.* i. e. then the Church is not a Political Society, with one conſtitutive Regent Head, which I readily grant, and ſee no inconvenience in it. Though Mr. *B.* cunningly ſuppoſes in his Argument, what he knows I denyed him; that there is ſuch a *ſumma Poteſtas*, or ſupreme Regent Power over the whole Church, and then

then indeed it were abſurd to deny a conſtitutive Regent Head. Cap. 4.

2. *Then a Biſhop is no conſtitutive part of a Dioceſan Church, nor a Metropolitan of a Metropolitan Church, nor a Patriarch of a Patriarchal Church, nor any* ſumma Poteſtas *of any Church; or elſe the Catholick, and theſe are not univocally called Churches.* The Force of which reaſoning is this; that if there be not a ſupreme Regent Head over the whole Church, there cannot be ſuch a ſuperior Governor over any part of the Church. A Biſhop cannot govern his own Church, unleſs one Biſhop, or Colledge of Biſhops be a ſupreme conſtitutive Regent Head over the whole Church: For as for Metropolitans and Patriarchs, I never owned their original Right to ſuch a Superiority, but aſcribe it to Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions, which are very juſtifiable, and of great uſe to the Preſervation of Catholick Communion: And I do not ſee, what inconvenience there is in granting, that a particular, and the Catholick Church, are not univocally called Churches, that is, are not in the ſame ſenſe called a Church, any more than in ſaying, that a Part, and the Whole, are not in the ſame

ſenſe

Cap. 4. ſenſe called the Body of a man, for the Whole contains all the Parts, and a Part is only a Part of the Whole: All the particular Churches in the World, are univocally called Churches, as being under the Government of their reſpective Paſtors, in obedience to the Laws and Inſtitutions of our Saviour, the only univerſal Biſhop of his Church, but the Catholick Church is called a Church, from the Union of all particular Churches, not only to Chriſt, the ſupreme Regent Head of the Church, but to each other in one Catholick Communion.

3. *If the* ſumma Poteſtas, *be not a conſtitutive part of the Church Catholick, it is no eſſential Part*; unleſs by this *ſumma Poteſtas* over the whole Church, he means Chriſt (which alters the ſtate of the Queſtion, of which more preſently) it is ſo far from being an eſſential part of the Church Catholick, that it is no part at all; there being no ſuch ſupreme Power over the whole Church: But, *if ſo, the Church muſt be defined without it; and why do they not give us ſuch a Definition, and tell us, what is the conſtitutive Form of it, if this be not?* None ſo blind, as thoſe who will not ſee. How often have I told him, what

it

it is, which makes the Catholick Church one Catholick Church, which is the conſtitutive Form he enquires after, *viz.* not one Superior Power over the whole Church, but one Communion? Cap. 4.

4. *And then he that denyeth this* ſumma Poteſtas, *and ſeparateth from it, denyeth or ſeparateth from nothing eſſential to the Church*; very right! *Why then do they make obedience eſſential to a Member?* Obedience to what? To one ſupreme Regent Head over the Church. Who are they that make ſuch obedience neceſſary to a Member? Or may not every Chriſtian be bound to obey his ſpiritual Guides, and Paſtors, unleſs there be one ſupreme Regent Head over the Catholick Church? Now whatever *Lawyers, and men acquainted with the common Terms of Law and Politicks*, to whom Mr. *B.* appeals, may think of ſuch Diſputes, as theſe; I am confident be they what they will, if they be men of ſenſe, they will pity the drudgery of anſwering ſuch trifling Cavils. Though I am glad to hear Mr. *B.* own it as a thing beyond Diſpute, that *a King is the conſtitutive Head*, that is, the ſupreme Regent Head of his Kingdom, without whoſe ſupreme Government it is not a Kingdom.

Mr.

Cap. 4. Mr. *B.* proceeds. *But ſaith this Doctor, Its original conſtitution differs from ſecular Forms of Government, by that ancient Church-canon of our Saviours own decreeing, it ſhall not be ſo among you*, which I alleadged to prove, that the Church could not be a Political Society in Mr. *B*'s notion of it, with a ſupreme conſtitutive Regent Power over the whole: To which Mr. *B.* anſwers, *There is ſome hope in this Citation. It ſeems he thinks, that by theſe words Chriſt forbad any conſtitutive Supreme under him in his Church.* Yes verily I do think ſo. *Why then does the man ſo fiercely diſpute for it*, againſt it he means ſurely, for that I have profeſſedly done, but never diſputed for it yet. *If there be none, we are agreed*: In good time; why then does he and Mr. *H.* ſo rudely ſcorn and deride the Dean, as one who has betrayed the Church, by denying the neceſſity of a conſtitutive Regent Head? I may be a young Doctor, as he pleaſantly adds, but I perceive he grows ſo old, that he forgets what he is for or againſt.

But he is unwilling this ſhould be my meaning, becauſe this ſpoils his Notion of a Political body; and therefore ſpitefully inſinuates what he ſays he will not

not impute to me, that I ſpeak of a *Politie that hath the Power of the Sword*; and yet immediately after this Complement he pawns his own underſtanding for it, that I muſt mean ſo. *I will therefore rather conclude, that if he know what he ſaith, I am uncapable of knowing, rather than impute this to him; or elſe that he takes it to be no Policy, that hath not the Power of the Sword:* Let the controverſie reſt there then, and we will leave it to wiſer men to judge between us. Cap. 4.

But Mr. *B.* and Mr. *H.* do not agree about that Citation, *It ſhall not be ſo among you.* Mr. *B.* thinks it a hopeful Citation, and is agreed with me about it. Mr. *H.* ſayes, none *but ſuch a forward one*, would have alleadged it to this purpoſe, let them now agree this Matter between themſelves. Def. p. 564

For now I ſhall leave Mr. *B.* a while to hear what Mr. *H.* ſays to the main Diſpute. He undertook in Anſwer to the Dean, to produce an Argument for the Proof of a conſtitutive Regent Head of the Church, which Mr. *B.* was ſo ſubtil, as to prove only by a Definition. His Argument was this. *There is a Government in the Church of* England.—*Where there is a Government, there* H's anſwer to Doctor *Still.* p. 12.

Cap. 4. *there muſt be a Political Society; every Political Body conſiſts of a* Pars Regens & ſubdita, —— *If the Church of* England *then be a Political Church, it muſt have a Regent part, and this conſtitutive Regent part muſt be aſſigned.* To this I

De'ence, p. 565. anſwered, by acknowledging that there is a Government in the Church conſidered as a Church; and if all Government made a Political Society, then a National Church may be owned to be a Political Society; *for Government by conſent without ſuperiority, is Government: That Church Governors united and governing by conſent, are the* pars Imperans; *Chriſtian People in obedience to the Laws of our Saviour, ſubmitting to ſuch Government, are the* pars Subdita, *and all this is true without a conſtitutive Regent Head.* The plain meaning of which is this. That there is a Government in the Church, as every Biſhop is the Governor of his own Church, which is but one Government, becauſe all Biſhops are bound by the Laws of our Saviour to govern their particular Churches by mutual Advice and Counſel, and one Conſent, as far as is neceſſary to the ends of Catholick Communion; and this may be done without any

any direct ſuperior Power of one Church, Cap. 4.
or Biſhop, or Colledge of Biſhops over all the Churches and Biſhops of the Chriſtian World, which is what Mr. *B.* calls a conſtitutive Regent Head over the whole Church.

Here Mr. *H.* diſputes with great Triumph, and wonders, I ſhould applaud the Dean for denying the neceſſity of a conſtitutive Regent Head of a National Church (conſidered as a Church, for that is the ſtate of the Queſtion, which he is willing to conceal) when I my ſelf have aſſerted ſuch a Head, *viz.* Reply, p. 131.
a Colledge of Biſhops, governing by conſent: But his miſtake in this matter, has been already ſufficiently expoſed in Anſwer to Mr. *Lob*, and he has added nothing new to deſerve a new Conſideration. *Supr. 146, &c.*

He ſays, *I underſtand the term Political, to be commenſurate with Civil*, but I ſay, I never did underſtand it ſo, and deny the Church to be a Political Society, only in Mr. *B*'s notion of Political, who aſſerts, that every Political body muſt have one ſupreme Regent Head over the Whole; which the Church has not, which is one, by one Communion, not by one ſupreme Power. p. 132.

Cap. 4. He ſays, *I have found out a Head for the Church, which is Ariſtocratical, and yet thinks the Church cannot be Political, unleſs it have ſome Head, that is Perſonal, or as if a Head Collective, were not one Head, as well as one that is Monarchical.* Yes, no doubt but it is; but I neither know ſuch a Collective, nor Monarchical Head.

p. 133. But do I not aſſert, *That a National Church is a Political Society?* Yes, I do aſſert, *that if Government* (as diſtinguiſht from one conſtitutive Regent Head) *makes a Political Society, then the Church*, (which is a governed Society) *is a Political Society, for Government by conſent without Superiority* (i. e. without one ſupreme Regent Head) *is Government.* But *if I grant a Government by conſent, underſtanding by it the Epiſcopal Colledge, or* Cyprians *one Epiſcopacy, as the governing Part, and the People by the Law of Chriſt ſubdite to it, then I have found out a conſtitutive Head, and an Eccleſiaſtical conſtitutive Head by Chriſts inſtitution:* For *an united Colledge of Biſhops for Government* (gratia Regiminis) *is a formal Eccleſiaſtical Head.* I need give no new Anſwer to this, having already ſufficiently explain-

explained, what is meant by St. *Cyprian*'s one Epiſcopacy, and the Colledge of Biſhops, which is far enough from being ſuch an Eccleſiaſtical conſtitutive Regent Head of the Church. Cap. 4.

But to return to Mr. *Baxter*; he makes great ſport with that Propoſition, that *Government by conſent without ſuperiority is Government.* And 1. he expounds *this governing by conſent without ſuperiority*, to be *governing without ſuperiority over the* pars Subdita, or over the People, who muſt be ſubject to this Government, *it is governing* ſine jure regendi. *But then I hope we break not the 5th. Commandment by diſobeying them.* But this I ſuppoſe, was only to ſhew his skill in Drollery, and in turning plain ſence into non-ſence, I wiſh at laſt he would give us as plain a Proof that he underſtood ſence. It were well indeed for him, that Biſhops had no Authority to govern; for then, as he well obſerves, they might be Schiſmaticks without ſin. Anſwer to Dr. *Sherl.* p. 205.

But Mr. *B.* did not think this anſwer would ſatisfie any man, though he knew the ſpite of it would greatly entertain a true Fanatick Zeal: And therefore he adds. *But I rather think the Doctor meant without ſuperiority over one another.*

Cap. 4. *Anſ. And verily doth the Church of* England *think, that an Ariſtocracy is no conſtitutive Head, or* ſumma Poteſtas, *or form of Policy? Had the Senators at* Rome *Power over one another, as ſuch? Or hath the* Venetian *Senate, Or the* Polonian *Parliament men? Doth this novelty and ſingularity deſerve no word of Proof, but* ipſe dixit? *See how all Politicks are damned with the non-Conformiſts, for making Ariſtocracy a Species of Policy. But I pray you, uſe them not all for it as hardly, as you uſe us. But really thus much of the World is governed.*

Mr. *B.* I ſee, (as Mr. *H.* ſays) is a man, who underſtands *Politicks*, and I dare not pretend to ſo much skill in the *Roman*, *Venetian*, or *Polonian* government, but this I think, I can ſafely ſay, as little as I know of them, that the Colledg of Biſhops is neither one nor t'other, nor any kind of Ariſtocracy; for when I ſpeak of a Government without ſuperiority (that is, without a ſupreme conſtitutive Regent Head, which was the Subject of the Diſpute) it is as wild to imagine, that I mean an Ariſtocracy, which is ſuch a Regent Head, as that, *by without ſuperiority*, I mean,

218 *govern-*

governing without ſuperiority over the pars Subdita. But we muſt leave Mr. *B.* to his own way; who thinks he has anſwered his Adverſary ſufficiently, when by a perverſe Comment, he has made him ſpeak or write non-ſence; which muſt be acknowledged the beſt way of confuting Books, when he cannot confute the true and genuine ſenſe of them. Cap. 4.

But as to the thing; when I ſay there is a Government in the Church without ſuperiority, or without a conſtitutive Regent Head, the plain meaning is this. That every Biſhop is the chief Governor of his own Church, and thus the whole Church is a governed Society, as every particular Church is under the Government of its own Paſtor; no Biſhops, either ſingle or united, having any direct Authority or Superiority over each other. Now though in Ariſtocracy, every individual Patrician and Senator have equal Power, yet the Government is not in any of theſe diſtinct, but in the whole Senate, whether that ſignifie the Majority of Voices, or the unanimous Vote of every Member of it, and this makes it properly a Regent Head. But to help Mr. *B.* to underſtand this; if Pride and Intereſt will give him leave,

Cap. 4. I ſhall particularly conſider the difference between Ariſtocracy, and the Government of the Church by Biſhops, without a Regent Head.

Every Biſhop is the ſupreme Governor of his own Church, but no Senator, meerly as a Senator, hath any immediate Right, much leſs the ſupreme Right of Government in any diſtinct part of the Nation. For the Government of the Whole is in the Senate, who appoint ſubordinate Governors, either ſome of their own Members, or others; in dependence on themſelves, who act not by their own, but by the Authority of the Senate.

Every Biſhop may govern his own Church by his own prudence, has his *Arbitrium proprium*, as St. *Cyprian* ſpeaks; may regulate publick Worſhip, and preſcribe Rules of Diſcipline for his own Church, without depending on the Authority of any other Biſhop, or Councils of Biſhops, nor is accountable to any, while he preſerves the Purity of Faith and Worſhip, the Unity of the Church, and Catholick Communion, but no ſingle Senator in an Ariſtocracy has any Power of making Laws himſelf, but only in conjunction with others.

The

The Combinations of Churches, and the Synods and Councils of Biſhops are not for direct acts of Government and Superiority over each other, but for the preſervation of Catholick Communion, which is moſt effectually done by mutual Advice and Counſel, which I think differs a little from the Soveraign Power of an Ariſtocracy. Cap. 4.

When Neighbour Biſhops thus unite into one Body, and agree upon ſome common rules of Worſhip or Diſcipline, they govern indeed every one their particular Churches by common Advice and Conſent, but ſtill by their own Epiſcopal Authority : They do not receive any Authority from the Synod to govern their Churches, but only agree among themſelves upon ſome common rules of Government, and therefore the Synod is not a Regent Head, becauſe it gives no new Authority; which is quite contrary in an Ariſtocracy, which is the Fountain of all Power for the Government of ſuch a Nation : Which ſhews, how well skilled Mr. *H.* is in Politicks, who thinks, that *if the Biſhops rule by a Superiority over the People, that makes it an Ariſtocratical Government.* Reply, P. 134.

And

Cap. 4. And this may ſatisfie Mr. *B.* what I mean by a Government by *Conſent* without Superiority, or a Regent Head: Which he turns alſo into Ridicule: *It is not a conſtitutive Supremacy, but a Supremacy by conſent*: No Sir, it is no Supremacy at all; but every Biſhop governs his own Dioceſs by his own Authority, but with the Advice and Conſent of a Synod, or Council, or Neighbour Biſhops: A conſent I ſay, not as to the Power of governing, but as to the Rules of Government. And therefore I am not concerned to Diſpute with him, how far *Conſent* is neceſſary to all Government: I ſhall only obſerve, how Mr. *H.* miſtakes both the Dean and me, in what we ſpeak about *Conſent*: *The Doctor* (he ſays) *holds that Conſent is ſufficient to the making a National Church, underſtanding by Conſent, a Conſent to be of it*: *The Deans Defender holds the Church to be a Government by Conſent, meaning by it the Conſent of the Biſhops; theſe are two contrary things, the one making the Church not Political, and the other makes it an Ariſtocracy*: But indeed it is neither ſo, nor ſo, but Mr. *H.* underſtands neither, as appears from what I have already Diſcourſed: There

Government by Conſent without Superiority 214

is

is no other Conſent required to become a Member of the National Church, then there is to be a Member of the Catholick Church, that is, a Conſent to be a Chriſtian; for every Chriſtian is bound to live in Catholick Communion, as a Member of the one body of Chriſt: And if Catholick Communion makes all the Churches in the World one Catholick Church, it makes all the Churches in a Nation one National Church: But that ſtricter Combination of Churches in the ſame Nation under a Patriarch, or Metropolitan, or National Synods is a National Church Government by conſent, as I have already explained it, which is highly uſeful to preſerve Peace and Communion between neighbour-Churches, whoſe neighbourhood requires a more cloſe and intimate Union, than there can be between Churches of different Nations, under different Princes, and at a greater diſtance. Cap. 4.

There is but one thing more remains to be conſidered, and ſo I will put an end to this Chapter, and ſquabling Diſpute. And that is to vindicate the Deans Argument againſt the neceſſity of Mr. *B*'s. conſtitutive Regent Head of the National Church, which in ſhort was

Cap. 4. was this. *If every Church must have a constitutive Regent Part as essential to it, then it unavoidably follows, that there must be a Catholick visible Head to the Catholick visible Church, and so* Mr. *B's constitutive Regent part of a Church hath done the* Pope *a wonderful kindness, and made a very plausible Plea for his universal Pastorship.* Mr. *B.* indeed says, that the universal Church is *headed by Christ himself*, but as the Dean adds, *this doth not remove the difficulty; for the Question is about that visible Church, whereof the particular Churches are parts; and they being visible parts, do require a visible constitutive Regent Head, as essential to them; therefore the whole visible Church must have likewise a visible constitutive Regent part*, i. e. *a visible Head of the Church.*

See the Defence, p. 572. &c.

What Mr. *B.* and Mr. *H.* answered to the Deans Argument, I considered and answered in the Defence, and Mr. *B.* thought fit to let this Dispute fall; but Mr. *H.* who has not discretion enough to know when he is answered, was resolved to try one trick more with it, and see what Logick will do: And he says, he has discovered *four Terms in the Deans Argument*, and if so, I promise you, it is a very material discovery, and the Argu-

Reply, p. 135.

gument muſt be falſe and fallacious, nay, Cap. 4.
it ſeems, I have done worſe than the Dean, and have put in a 5th. Term, this is foul play I confeſs, but let us hear, how it is. *I will tell them both plainly* (ſays Mr. *H.* who is indeed a very plain Writer) *the Doctor may be aſhamed to put in a fourth Term into his Argument, and this man truly takes the ſhame on him by bringing in a fifth alſo. That which Mr.* p. 137.
Baxter *ſaid, was this. That every proper Political Church muſt have a conſtitutive Head, and the Doctor both leaves out the words proper Political, and brings in the term Viſible; Therefore the Catholick Church* (ſays he) *muſt have a conſtitutive viſible Head. The Interpoſer now to take off the ſhame from the Doctor, hath taken the right Courſe* (*I ſay*) *for he comes and does worſe, and that is, puts in a fifth term into the Argument; if every Church* (*when he ſhould ſay, every proper Political Church only, if he ſpeaks to Mr.* Baxter) *muſt have a viſible ſubordinate conſtitutive Head, then muſt the Catholick Church have ſuch a one; but that not having ſuch a one, a National Church, as well as the Catholick, may be without a conſtitutive Head.* I was in a horrible fright, when I heard four and five terms, and

Cap. 4. and began to bluſh at it; but if this be all the Buſineſs, I ſhall be able to bear this ſhame very well.

As for the Deans leaving out the terms *proper Political*, I gave a reaſon-
Def. 562. able account of that in the Defence, which Mr. *H.* takes no notice of: For Mr. *B.* defines a proper Political Church to be a Church, which has one conſtitutive Regent Head, and therefore the Dean denies, that a National Church is a proper Political Church, conſidered as a Church, in Mr. *B's* ſence of the Words, and this certainly was reaſon enough to leave it out, and yet to gratifie Mr. *H.* we will take it in, if he will but allow the Catholick Church to be as *proper Political* a Church, as the National Church is; and then the Argument runs thus. *If a National Church, as a proper Political Church, muſt have a National conſtitutive Regent Head, as eſſential to it; then the Catholick Church as a proper Political Church, muſt have a Catholick viſible Regent Head eſſential to it.* And thus I think it comes much to one, and let Mr. *B.* and Mr. *H.* take their choice.

But what ſhall we do with the Deans fourth term the *viſible Head*, time was, when

when Mr. *B.* and Mr. *H.* thought this no inconvenience at all, nor any ſurreptitious fourth term crept into the Argument, but learnedly diſputed, that Chriſt is the viſible Head of the Catholick Church; and therefore the Catholick Church hath a viſible Head, as well as the National Church. But let us briefly conſider, whether *viſible* be a fourth Term, or only added as a neceſſary Explication of Mr. *B's* Propoſition, if he mean any thing by it: For I think *Logicians* diſtinguiſh between a fourth Term, and an additional explication of the Terms. Cap. 4.

Mr. *B.* diſputes, *that every proper Political Church, and therefore a National Church muſt have a conſtitutive Regent Head*: Does he mean by this conſtitutive Regent Head, a viſible Head on Earth, or an inviſible Head in Heaven? If he means Chriſt as an inviſible Head in Heaven, then there is no Diſpute between us; for we will readily grant, that Chriſt is the Head of the National, as well as of the Catholick Church: If he means a viſible Head on Earth, then *Viſible* is no fourth Term, but only an explication of what Mr. *B.* means by a conſtitutive Regent Head: And then the Argu-

Cap. 4. Argument holds good from a National, to the Catholick Church. That if a National Church, as a proper Political Church, muſt have a viſible Conſtitutive Regent Head on Earth eſſential to it; then the Catholick Church, as a proper Political Church, muſt have a viſible conſtitutive Regent Head on Earth eſſential to it; or Mr. *B*'s Argument is not true, that every proper Political Church muſt have a viſible Regent Head on Earth eſſential to it.

Thus, I think, the Dean is once more defended, but I muſt ſpeak one good word for my ſelf too, as Charity obliges me. Mr. *H. ſays*, I bring in a fifth Term, *ſubordinate* viſible Head. But this is only a farther explication of Mr. *B*'s Terms to prevent their cavilling evaſions. Mr. *B.* ſays, every proper Political Church muſt have a conſtitutive Regent Head; does he mean this of Chriſt, as the ſupreme Head of his Church; or of men, whether Civil or Eccleſiaſtical Perſons, as a ſubordinate Head under Chriſt? if the firſt, there is no diſpute between us; for Chriſt is the Head of every part of his Church: If the ſecond, *a ſubordinate Head*, then *ſubordinate* is neither a fourth nor a fifth Term,

Term, but included in a conſtitutive Regent Head; and I think I need not ſpend time to prove, that Mr. *H*'s inſtance of adding *Monarchical*, to a viſible ſubordinate conſtitutive Regent Head, is not a parallel caſe; becauſe Monarchical would be properly a fourth Term, as not being neceſſarily involved in a conſtitutive Regent Head, as *Viſible and Subordinate* are; for a conſtitutive Regent Head may be either Monarchical or Collective, but ſignifies neither determinately, unleſs it be expreſſed. Cap. 4.

I ſhall only obſerve, how Mr. *B.* and Mr. *H.* are apparently guilty of this fallacy themſelves, of introducing a fourth and a fifth Term in anſwer to the Deans Argument. If a National Church, as a proper Political Church, muſt have a conſtitutive Regent Head, then the Catholick Church as a proper Political Church muſt have a conſtitutive Regent Head: Yes, ſaith Mr. *B.* and Mr. *H.* ſo it hath; for Chriſt is the conſtitutive Regent Head of the Catholick Church. Where we plainly ſee, that in the Antecedent, by a conſtitutive Regent Head, they underſtand a Viſible, Subordinate, and Mr. *H.* ſays, an accidental Head of the Church; and in the Conſequent, a

Cap. 5. ſupreme inviſible Head of the Church, which is as fallacious a way of anſwering, as it is of arguing. And now I leave the Reader to judge, where the ſhame, which Mr. *H.* ſo much talks of, muſt at laſt reſt. But Ignorance and Inſenſibility are as great a ſecurity to ſome men againſt ſhame, as Impudence is to others.

CHAP. V.

Concerning that one Communion, which is eſſential to the Catholick Church, and the practicableneſs of it.

IN the eighth Chapter of the Defence, I briefly ſtated, what the Communion is, which is eſſential to the Catholick or Univerſal Church; and what place there can be for this Catholick Communion, in this broken and divided ſtate of the Church, which we ſee at this day. Mr. *B.* in his Anſwer, Chap. 6. attempts to ſay ſomething to it, but it is ſuch a ſomething, as needs no farther anſwer; for it all proceeds upon his own blundering or wilful miſtakes about the nature of Chriſtian Communion,

nion, and a ſupreme Regent Head of the Catholick Church: And both theſe I have diſcourſed ſo fully already, that I cannot excuſe my ſelf to my Reader, ſhould I repeat over the ſame things again; and therefore I ſhall only briefly conſider ſome few new Objections he has ſtarted, which though they are very trifling, yet may diſturb an injudicious Reader. Cap. 5.

I aſſerted, *That Catholick Communion ſtrictly ſo called, conſiſts,* 1. *In the agreement and Concord of the Biſhops of the Catholick Church among themſelves, and with each other.* Here Mr. *Baxter* (1) plays the Critick: *He knows not*, he ſays, *how Agreement and Concord differ; nor among themſelves, and with each other*: Nor it may be, is there any material difference between them; but is this ſuch an unpardonable fault, to uſe Synonomous words, eſpecially when a man has to deal with ſuch cavillers? It is a good ſign Mr. *B.* has no great matter to ſay, when he condeſcends to play at ſo low a game. Defence p. 595. Anſwer. p. 212.

1. But he adds, *does this man dream, that no Biſhops are Chriſtians and Catholicks, that have any diſagreement? That is no two in the World.* I hope many

Car. 5. Biſhops agree better than Mr. *B.* thinks they do; who agreeing with no body himſelf, judges of others by his own wrangling humour: But yet I believe Biſhops may diſagree about many things, and yet preſerve the Concord and Unity of the Epiſcopacy in one Catholick Communion: St. *Cyprian*, I am ſure, thought this very poſſible, when he allows of ſuch differences without breaking Communion; and that in ſo high a point, as the rebaptization of Hereticks.

Cyprian rejected the Baptism of Hereticks; Stephen Bp of Rome, St Austin, and Optatus, were against the Donatists condemn'd their practice of Re-baptizing the Catholicks, 129. Def. 197.

2. *But is Communion of Biſhops only neceſſary to Church-unity? Why not of Presbyters alſo?* Communion of Presbyters with their Biſhop, is eſſential to the Unity of a particular Church, as I had diſcourſed in the *6th.* Chapter of the Defence; but the Union of one Church with another, principally conſiſts in the Agreement and Concord of Biſhops, who are the chief Governors of their Churches: And thoſe Presbyters, who live in Communion with their Biſhop, are ſuppoſed to live in Communion with thoſe, who are in Communion with him: Or if any Presbyter ſhould diſſent, this makes no ſchiſm between the Churches, only makes him himſelf a Schiſmatick.

3. But

3. But, ſays Mr. *B. Who doubts but there muſt be Communion?* I am glad to hear this is out of doubt; I aſſure him, I do not doubt of it. *But the Queſtion is, whether it muſt be in or under an Ariſtocratical Sovereign?* But whoſe Queſtion is this Sir? It is none of mine, for I always denyed it, and made no queſtion about it: I ſuppoſe you would have ſaid, this ſhould have been the Queſtion, and then you had had ſomething to ſay to it. It is a troubleſome thing, I confeſs, to meet with a perverſe Diſputant, who denies wrong, and chooſes that ſide of the Queſtion, which we are not prepared to oppoſe. Cap. 5.

Well, but I aſſert out of St. *Cyprian*, *That no man can have the Authority or Honour of a Biſhop, who does not preſerve the Peace and Unity of the Epiſcopacy, that is, who does not live in Unity with his Fellow-Biſhops.* Here Mr. *B.* ſuppreſſes the name of St. *Cyprian*, whoſe Authority is venerable in the Chriſtian Church, and leaves out *the Peace and Unity of the Epiſcopacy*, and is reſolved to confute this raw pitiful notion under the name of *Sherlock*, not of St. *Cyprian*; and thus he aſſaults it.

Cap. 5. Anſ. *But what Unity? No one that liveth not in a Union in the eſſentials of Chriſtianity and Miniſtry? But* Chryſoſtom *and* Theophilus Alex. *and* Epiphanius, *might all be Biſhops, though they had much diſcord, and condemned one another. And ſo might* Cyril, *and* Memnon, *and* Johan. Antioch, *and* Theodoret, *and the* Orthodox, *and the* Novatians, *and the* Eaſtern *and* Weſtern *Biſhops ſince; and the Old and the New ſort of* Engliſh *Biſhops, if they differ not* totâ Specie.

I wondered this *totâ Specie* did not come in before: For theſe Quarrels and Contentions of *Dioceſan* Biſhops is one principal Argument, whereby Mr. *B.* proves, that they differ *totâ Specie*, from the true Apoſtolical, *i. e.* Parochial Biſhops; and we have got ſome ground by this, that he owns, they may be Biſhops, notwithſtanding they had much Diſcord, and condemned one another.

As for the *Novatian* Biſhops, who were guilty of a formal Schiſm from the Catholick Church, they may be called Biſhops, as the *Novatian* People might be called Chriſtians, which I have already given a particular Account of 73, &c from

from St. *Austin*, but they were not Catholick Bishops, as the *Novatians* were not Catholick Christians; though for ought I perceive Mr. *B.* thinks the *Novatians* as good Bishops as the *Orthodox*. Cap. 5.

As for the Case of St. *Chrysostom*, *Theophilus Alexandrinus*, and *Epiphanius*, that was a personal Quarrel, and though this indeed destroyed that Unity, which ought to have been maintained between these good men, who were all of them Bishops, yet it did not destroy *the Peace and Unity of the Episcopacy*, which was the only Unity of Bishops, I asserted necessary to Catholick Communion; though Mr. *B.* was pleased to conceal that, to make his Argument appear more plausible. The Unity of the Episcopacy consists in this, that all Bishops live in the Communion of the same Church, as members of the same Body, and as near as they can, govern their Churches by mutual Advice and Consent; This St. *Chrysostom*, and *Theophilus*, and *Epiphanius* did in the height of their Quarrel: They owned the same Church, and governed their respective Churches by the same Ecclesiastical Laws and Canons, which preserved

Unity of the Episcopacy, wherein it consists.

Cap. 5. ſerved the Unity of the Epiſcopacy; But *Theophilus* had a perſonal Quarrel againſt St. *Chryſoſtom*, and drew *Epiphanius* and ſome other Biſhops to his ſide, and did at laſt prevail ſo far, as to depoſe him, very undeſervedly. This was a very great fault in theſe good men, a very ſcandalous breach between theſe Biſhops, but no Schiſm in the Epiſcopacy: For they ſtill acknowledged the ſame Order, the ſame Communion, and the ſame Rules of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline. But of this more anon.

Defence, p. 596. I obſerved in the Defence, that there were ſeveral ways, whereby this Communion among Biſhops was expreſſed and maintained. As 1. By writing Letters to, and receiving Letters from one another about Church-Affairs; and I inſtanced in their ſending the names of any Biſhops elected into vacant Sees, that they might know, who were Catholick Biſhops, and who not. To this Mr. *B.* anſwers. 1. *So do the* Independents *and* Presbyterians; what do they do? Write Letters? No doubt of it! And ſo did the *Novatians*, and the *Donatiſts*, and yet were Schiſmaticks for all that. And this was one reaſon, why the Catholick Biſhops gave an account

to

to each other, who were their Colleagues, that ſo they might be aware of the Letters of Schiſmaticks. I hope, it is no argument, that Catholick Biſhops cannot expreſs and maintain Catholick Communion by ſuch Letters, becauſe Schiſmaticks may in the ſame way maintain a Schiſmatical Confederacy. But ſays Mr. *B.* *do none this* (*i. e.* write Letters) *but a Soveraign Senate*? Yes, particular Biſhops did, as I inſtanced in St. *Cyprian*, who ſent a Catalogue of the names of Catholick Biſhops to *Cornelius*. But 2. *Is this the Communion that unifyeth the Church*? *I hope it is a Church, and men are members of it, before they write Letters.* No doubt at all! But did I ſay, that the Communion of the Church conſiſted in writing Letters, or that it was expreſſed and maintained by it? Mr. *B.* is a very unhappy man at diſtinctions; he can never find a good diſtinction, when there is want of it; and never wants diſtinctions, where there is no difference. Cap. 5.

2. The next way of maintaining Catholick Communion among Biſhops, I obſerved, was *by adviſing together about the publick affairs of the Church, and Communicating Counſels with each other, and giving*

Cap. 5. *giving an account of the reaſons of their Actions, (that there might be no miſunderſtanding between them)* theſe laſt words, which I have included in a Parentheſis, Mr. *Baxter* has left out of his Citation, becauſe they did too plainly diſcover, how this mutual Advice and Counſel did tend to maintain Catholick Unity. And anſwers, 1. *This* Independents *are ready to do*: What then? Does it hence follow, that they are Catholick Biſhops? Schiſmaticks may do many things, which true Catholick Chriſtians do, and be Schiſmaticks ſtill. 2. *How doth this differ from the former? Do you not mean adviſing by Letters or Meſſengers? If not, is it general Councils you mean, or what?* I told my meaning very plain: Sometimes one particular Biſhop writ to another. Sometimes Neighbour Biſhops met in Provincial Synods, and ſent their Synodical Letters to Forraign Churches. But this is writing Letters ſtill, and how does it differ from the former? Why Sir, only as a Letter containing an account of the preſent ſtate of the Church, what Biſhops die, and who are ordained in their ſtead, who are Catholicks, and who are Schiſmaticks, does from a Letter of Advice and Coun-

Counſel, &c. but *how is it we muſt advise with them of* Armenia, Abaſſia, *and the reſt?* When Mr. *B.* can prove, that I make it neceſſary to do ſo, I will undertake to find out a way to do it; but this, and what follows about Provincial Counſels, has been ſufficiently conſidered above. Cap. 5.

3. Mr. *B.* proceeds, *But how? Is it only publick Affairs that the Colledge adviſeth you about?* The Man dreams, who talks of the advice of the Colledge? *Who is it then that muſt diſpoſe of the Church, State, and Souls of all us Individuals?* Every particular Biſhop with the aſſiſtance of his *Presbyters*, muſt take care of his own Church, and the Souls committed to him; and that he may do this the better, in all difficult [illegible], eſpecially ſuch as concern the whole Church, muſt take the beſt Advice of his Fellow-Biſhops, that he can, where is the abſurdity of all this? Surely Mr. *B.* makes himſelf more ignorant than he is, when he adds, *It ſeems it is ſome body below the Senate, that is meant, when we are told, that we muſt obey the univerſal Church. I thought whither it would come at laſt.* And well he might think whither it would come, when he was

Cap. 5. was reſolved whither to carry it.

3. I obſerved another way of expreſſing and maintaining this Catholick Communion, *was by Letters of recommendation granted to* Presbyters, *or private Chriſtians (who had occaſion to travel) from thoſe Churches of which they were members, to other Churches, whither they went, which were called Formed or Communicatory Letters, the uſe of which I there explained.* To which Mr. *Baxter* anſwers. 1. *Are not all theſe three Proofs the ſame, writing Letters of Church-affairs, Conſultation, and Communication?* Yes, writing Letters is writing Letters moſt certainly, but I imagine there may be ſome difference with reference to the Subject about which men write: And that Letters of recommendation differ ſomething from Letters of advice. 2. *Do any of us deny his Concluſion, that this proveth Communion among them?* Why then does he not own this Catholick Communion which I contend for, and which infallibly proves him to be a Schiſmatick? No, but I ſhould prove *an Epiſcopal Colledge, as one Ariſtocratical ſupreme Regent Head.* I thank him for nothing, I am not at leiſure to write ſuch Books on purpoſe for him to confute them.

But

But, 3. He ſays, *theſe communicatory Letters the Non-conformiſts are greatly for; that no man may be admitted to Communion in any particular Church, without either a Perſonal underſtanding, owning of his Baptiſmal Covenant, or a Teſtimonial, that he hath done it, and been received into Communion with ſome Church, with whom we have ſuch Communion as is due between ſeveral Churches.* Quidlibet ex Quolibet! How cleverly has Mr. *B.* turned theſe Communicatory Letters into an examination by Lay Elders, or an *Independent* Church-covenant; and the one Communion of the Catholick Church, into *ſuch a Communion as is due between ſeveral Churches?* I could wiſh as heartily as Mr. *B.* that greater care were taken in the Diſcipline of the Church, though they who make the greateſt Complaints of the want of it, are the true cauſe of this defect. But what is this to Communicatory Letters? Or what if Schiſmaticks are for Communicatory Letters among themſelves, are they ever the leſs Schiſmaticks for that? All that I deſigned to prove by theſe Communicatory Letters, was this; that the Ancient Church did believe, that every Chriſtian as a Chriſtian was a member Cap. 5.

Cap. 5. member of the Catholick Church, and had a right to Christian-communion where he came; which cannot be, unless all Christians are one Body, and all particular Churches, members of one Catholick Church.

And here I had occasion to express my dissent from a very great man, whose memory is as dear and venerable to me, as to most of his particular and intimate Friends. I mean Dr. *Barrow*, *Defence p. 601.* and I think I express my dissent from him with all that modesty, and just respect, which is due to his memory. I acknowledged that he had abundantly confuted that notion of a Constitutive Regent Head of the Catholick Church, but yet that he made Catholick Communion too arbitrary a thing, like the Confederacies of Soveraign Princes. I should be heartily glad to see my self confuted in this point, and to find that I was mistaken in his judgment in this matter; if at least it may be called his Judgment, and not rather his Inadvertency.

I will not dispute with Mr. *B.* about the judgment of this Reverend Person; for I do not find, that he understands either of us: I am sure he urges such things

things in his Defence, as that great man would be aſhamed of; and I will not be ſo injurious to his memory ſo much as to repeat them: I may have occaſion to take notice of what he ſays upon ſome other ſcore, but Dr. *Barrows* name ſhall not be concerned in it. Cap. 5.

And now I come to the grand difficulty of all, which I did but juſt name in the Defence: *What place there can be for Catholick Communion in this broken and divided ſtate of the Church, which we ſee at this day*: If there be no Catholick Church without Catholick Communion, where ſhall we find the Catholick Church at this day, when ſo very few Churches live in Communion with each other? This makes ſome men ſuſpect, that Catholick Communion is a pretty Romantick notion of a Catholick Church, but ſo impracticable, that it is of no uſe to us now, nor will put an end to any one Controverſie or Schiſm in the Chriſtian Church. But this difficulty, when it is thorowly examin'd, will vaniſh of it ſelf. For

1. That there are Schiſms in the Chriſtian Church, is certainly no very good Argument againſt the neceſſity of Catholick Communion; and yet this is the

Cap. 5. the whole force of the Objection: That if Catholick Communion be essential to the Catholick Church, we must reduce the Catholick Church into a very narrow compass, and un-Church most of the Christian Churches in the World, as not maintaining this Catholick Communion: If this be so, I am heartily sorry for it, as every good man will be for the Degeneracy and Apostacy of any part of the Christian Church. But would Mr. *Baxter* have me frame some new Notions of Catholick-unity and Schism, to justifie the many Schisms and Separations of the Christian World? Must we fit our Notions of Church-unity to the present divided state of the Church, or endeavour to reduce a broken and divided Church to a true Primitive state of Unity? Suppose I had proved, that Catholick Doctrine instead of Catholick Communion, had been only essential to the being of the Catholick Church, and such another Objector as Mr. *B.* should urge me with this inconvenience, that then there are very few Churches, that are true Members of the Catholick Church: Because in most Ages, and at this day, there are such great breaches between several famous

mous Churches about what they think the moſt fundamental Articles of our Faith; muſt I therefore deny the neceſſity of Catholick Doctrine to a Catholick Church, for fear of that inference, that then there are many large and famous Churches, which are not true Catholick Apoſtolick Churches? This is the way, I confeſs, never to be without a Catholick Church; to make the Catholick Church to be what the preſent Churches are, not what they ought to be: But it is the way alſo to make a new Chriſtianity in every Age. Cap. 5.

And this is the more conſiderable, becauſe many of the Schiſms, which now are, and have been in many Ages of the Church, are owing to different apprehenſions in matters of Faith, which either are, or have been thought to be Catholick Doctrines: Such are the differences between the Greek and Latine Churches; the Church of *Rome*, and the Reformed Churches; the *Lutheran* and *Zuinglian* Churches: So that Mr. *B.* muſt either find out a Church without Catholick Doctrine, as well as without Catholick Communion, or muſt reduce the Catholick Church almoſt into as narrow a compaſs for want of Ca-

Cap. 5. tholick Doctrine, as for want of Catholick Communion: Unless he can prove, that these doctrinal Disputes are not of that Moment, as to cause Schisms in the Church; and then he will mightily enlarge Catholick Communion, and answer this formidable Objection himself.

II. No man can pretend, that Catholick Communion is in its own nature impracticable, because it was *de Facto*, religiously observed in the Primitive Church for several Ages. Thus it was in St. *Cyprian*'s, thus it was in St. *Austin*'s time, who made Catholick Communion essential to the being of a Catholick Church: And that cannot reasonably be thought an impracticable Notion, which has been practised in the Christian Church, and which is equally necessary to be practised in all Ages.

III. For what should hinder all good Christians from maintaining Communion with all Christian Churches, which are sound and orthodox in Faith, and Worship? If there be such Churches to be found in *France*, in *Germany*, in *Holland*, &c. What should hinder any sober Christian, who travels into those Countries and understands their Language, from

from joyning with them in all acts of Worſhip, as Members of the ſame Body of Chriſt? Thoſe Churches, which are not ſound and Orthodox, are not the Objects of Chriſtian Communion, and it is no breach of Catholick Communion, not to communicate with them: And nothing can reaſonably hinder our Communion with thoſe, that are. For where there are no ſinful terms of Communion impoſed, we are bound to all Acts of Communion, as opportunity ſerves. Cap. 5.

So that thoſe, who think it ſuch an impoſſible thing to maintain Catholick Communion among the Chriſtian Churches of this Age, muſt neceſſarily ſuppoſe, that there are very few Churches in the World at this time, which a ſound and orthodox Chriſtian can communicate with; for nothing elſe can make Catholick Communion impoſſible. And if this be true, it is a very ſad conſideration, and deeply to be lamented of all Chriſtians, but it is that, which I cannot help: Catholick Communion is very feaſible, when there are [redacted] Catholick Churches to communicate with, but when there are none, it cannot be had; or if there be

Cap. 5. but a few ſuch, it muſt be maintained among thoſe few, that are; and that is true Catholick Communion, which includes all true Catholick Churches, be they more or leſs.

But the thing at preſent to be conſidered, is this, whether he, who denies any Church to be a true Catholick Church, which does not maintain Catholick Communion, makes the Catholick Church any narrower than he does, who denies the poſſibility of Catholick Communion, becauſe there are very few Churches, which a good Chriſtian can ſafely communicate with. For I ſuppoſe, thoſe are no true Catholick Churches, which a Catholick Chriſtian muſt not communicate with; and Catholick Communion may be maintained among all other Churches, whoſe Communion is not ſinful and dangerous.

Anſwer to Dr. *Sherlock*, p. 18). As for inſtance, Mr. *Baxter* reckons up twelve Sects of Chriſtians in the World, as Members of the Catholick Church; his only doubt being concerning the Church of *Rome*: I ask Mr. *B.* then, whether theſe Churches be ſo ſound and orthodox, that a good Chriſtian may communicate with them? If they be, then here is a poſſibility of main-

maintaining Catholick Communion with all the Churches in the World, at leaſt excepting the Church of *Rome*: If they be not, how are they Catholick Churches? Are thoſe Catholick Churches, which are ſo corrupt and unſound, that a Catholick Chriſtian muſt not own their Communion? Catholick Communion may certainly be maintained with thoſe Churches, whoſe Communion is lawful; and I think it as certain, that thoſe Churches cannot be Members of the Catholick Church, whoſe Communion is unlawful. Cap. 5.

IIII. We may conſider farther, that in this preſent ſtate of things, there are not many poſitive Acts of Communion neceſſary to preſerve Catholick Communion between Forraign Churches; and therefore Catholick Communion is not ſo impracticable, as ſome may imagine. The Churches of diſtant Nations cannot worſhip God together, nor eaſily meet for Advice and Counſel, but they may own and receive each others Members, as occaſion ſerves, which ſignifies their Communion with each other. Nay, where there is no breach of Communion, no declared diſowning of each other, nor expreſs denial of any

Cap. 5. Act of Communion between diſtant Churches, thoſe Churches may be ſaid to be in Communion with each other. There are ſome Chriſtian Churches, which we know little or nothing of, nor they of us; but while we break not Communion with any ſound part of the Chriſtian Church, and profeſs Communion with all that are ſo, we may be truly ſaid to live in Catholick Communion with the whole Chriſtian Church.

It is true, as I obſerved in the Defence, in the Primitive Church they maintained Communion with diſtant Churches, by Formed and Communicatory Letters; by giving notice to each other of the ſtate of their ſeveral Churches, and adviſing and conſulting about Church Affairs; which was a prudent means of maintaining a ſtricter Communion and fair Correſpondence between them; and was eſpecially neceſſary at that time, when they lived under *Pagan* Emperors, and the external Unity of the Church was upheld only by Eccleſiaſtical Authority: But this was not abſolutely neceſſary to Catholick Communion, and is in a great meaſure impracticable now: The Empire

pire being divided into the hands of several Independent Christian Monarchs, who have the supreme Power in all Ecclesiastical, as well as civil Causes, there can be no such actual Correspondence between the Churches of several Nations, but by their consent and leave: Soveraign Princes, not Subjects, whether Civil or Ecclesiastical Persons, must treat with one another about the great Affairs of Church and State, though with the advice of their Civil or Ecclesiastical Counsellors: But still those Churches are in Communion with each other, who own each other as Members of the same Body, and deny no Act of Christian Communion to each other, as opportunity serves. And whether this be so very difficult, much less impossible, let any man judge. Cap. 5.

V. To make this appear still more easie and practicable, we may consider, that the Terms of Catholick Communion are not so straight and narrow, as some men make them. This is the true reason of most of the Schisms in the Christian Church, that some rash and inconsiderate People think, that every little difference, and petty controversie is a sufficient reason to divide the Church,

and ſet up diſtinct and ſeparate Communions: and have eſpouſed ſuch narrow Principles of Church Communion, that it is almoſt impoſſible any two Churches ſhould long hang together; much leſs that all the Churches in the world ſhould agree in ſuch matters. This Argument deſerves a more particular conſideration, as diſcovering the original of Church-diviſions and the cure of them; and therefore I ſhall briefly conſider upon what terms Catholick Communion may be maintained in the Chriſtian Church.

Now the terms of Catholick Communion may be reduced to theſe four general Heads; 1. Doctrine; 2. Government*; 3. Diſcipline; 4. Eccleſiaſtical Rites and Ceremonies.† *329. †371.

I. As for what concerns the Doctrines of Chriſtianity, I preſume my Adverſaries will readily grant, that an agreement in Fundamentals is a ſufficient Foundation for Catholick Communion; and I will as readily grant, that no Church which denies any Fundamental Article of our Religion, ought to be owned for a Catholick Church, or received into Catholick Communion. To deny Communion to any ſuch perſon, or Church, is no ſchiſm, no more than

it

it is to cut off a rotten and gangreened Member from the Body. And if it ſhould appear, that many or moſt Chriſtian Churches are over-run with ſuch Hereſies, as deſtroy the foundations of Chriſtianity, this muſt of neceſſity mightily ſtraighten Catholick Communion; not becauſe Catholick Communion is in it ſelf an impracticable notion, but becauſe there are but few Catholick Churches to communicate with; for it is as neceſſary a duty not to communicate with Churches, which renounce Catholick Doctrine, as it is to communicate with thoſe, which own it; we being under the ſame Obligations to maintain all fundamental Doctrines of Faith, as to preſerve the Peace and Communion of the Chriſtian Church: For indeed it is an ill way to preſerve the Peace of the Chriſtian Church, by forfeiting our Chriſtianity, as every fundamental Hereſie does; or to enlarge Chriſtian Communion, by receiving thoſe into our Communion, who are no Catholick Chriſtians. Cap. 5.

And I ſuppoſe, none of my adverſaries will require me to give ſuch a Catalogue of fundamental Doctrines, as are neceſſary to qualifie any Church for Ca-

Cap. 5. Catholick Communion: Both *Papists* and *Protestants* in their Disputes about Fundamentals, have always waved this, and there is no reason any harder terms should be put upon me; and thus I might end this Dispute honourably enough; for as far as respects Doctrines, every man must acknowledg, that Catholick Communion, may be as large as Catholick Doctrine, and that is as large, as it ought to be.

But yet for the greater satisfaction of my Readers, and of my self, I shall discourse this matter more particularly; for I confess, I do not understand the reason, why so many great men of our Church, as have writ against the *Papists*, since the happy reformation of Religion among us, have been so tender in this point; if we cannot tell, what are the fundamental Doctrines of Christianity, how can we be assured, that we, or any other Church do not err fundamentally? and how can we know, that the whole Church has not so erred, but only by that general promise, that the whole Church should not fall into fundamental errors? and if we can tell what Doctrines are fundamental, methinks it is not impossible, if occasion were, to give a Catalogue of them.

I

I am far enough from being of that mind, *That a Catalogue of Fundamentals is impoſſible, becauſe to ſome, more is fundamental, to others leſs, to others nothing at all, becauſe God requires more of them to whom he gives more, and leſs of them, to whom he gives leſs.* Which indeed does not only prove, that it is impoſſible to aſſign a Catalogue of Fundamentals, but that there is nothing in its own nature fundamental in Chriſtianity, but only for every man to believe, as much of it as he can. Cap. 5.

Yet the Caution of ſo many great men in this Matter, makes me very ſenſible, how nice a thing it is to talk of Fundamentals, and what unpardonable arrogance it would be in any private man, to be peremptory and dogmatical in aſſigning a Catalogue of them; and therefore I ſhall only pretend to make ſome Eſſay of this nature, which the argument I am now engaged in, and the clamorous Objections of ſome men extort from me; for if we cannot in ſome meaſure tell, what are the terms of Catholick Communion, Catholick Communion muſt needs be a very impracticable notion. And to prepare the way, I ſhall briefly obſerve ſome few things to pre-

Cap. 5. prevent ſome cavilling Objections, and Prejudices againſt the following Diſcourſe.

1. That by Fundamentals, I mean ſuch Doctrines as are eſſential to Chriſtianity, and diſtinguiſh the Chriſtian Religion from all other Religions: Now if we will acknowledg, that Chriſtian Religion is a fixt and certain thing, we muſt acknowledg, that there are ſuch Fundamentals, as are fixt and certain too, and do not alter with mens different Apprehenſions, Capacities, and Opportunities of Inſtruction; and if it be poſſible to underſtand the true difference between Chriſtianity, and all other Religions, it is poſſible to underſtand, what the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity are.

2. The greateſt difficulty, which is objected againſt a Catalogue of Fundamentals, does equally lie againſt the belief of Chriſtianity it ſelf. The difficulty is this, that the belief of all Fundamentals is neceſſary to Salvation, and therefore whoever aſſigns a Catalogue of Fundamentals, damns all thoſe who are of a different Opinion, which therefore is a work fit only for a daring and uncharitable man, or hæreticating Coun-

Councils, as Mr. *Baxter* calls them. Cap. 5.

Now in the ſame manner I may argue againſt the neceſſity of the Chriſtian Faith it ſelf. Whoever aſſerts it neceſſary to Salvation to believe in Chriſt, damns all *Jews*, *Pagans*, *Mahometans*, and all *Infidels*, which ſeems at leaſt as hard a thing, as to damn all *Hereticks*, who bear no proportion at all to the number of *Infidels*; and yet if the Chriſtian Faith it ſelf be neceſſary to Salvation, it muſt be neceſſary to Salvation, to believe ſome Articles of the Chriſtian Faith; for we cannot believe Chriſtianity, without believing ſuch Articles as contain the eſſentials of Chriſtian Faith, which do not alter with the Prejudices, Prepoſſeſſions, and Capacities of men, no more than Chriſtianity it ſelf. And yet neither I, nor any man elſe, have any thing to do to paſs a final Sentence, either upon *Infidels* or *Hereticks*, but they muſt ſtand or fall 272
to their own Maſter. There may be a ſtanding rule of Faith and Manners, whereby men ſhall be judged, but how far the ſoveraign and uncovenanted Grace of God may diſpence with this rule in equitable Caſes, is not my buſineſs to determine. But of this more hereafter, *inf.* 312, &c.

3. I

Cap. 5.

3. I obſerve, there are ſome Doctrines, which, if they be true, muſt be fundamental Truths, if they be falſe, muſt be fundamental Errors; becauſe they alter the very Foundations of Chriſtianity, and make two very different Religions of it, as I ſhall ſhew in what follows. There are indeed a great many erroneous Doctrines, which make great alterations in the Scheme of Religion, as all the Antinomian Doctrines do, which yet I cannot call fundamental Errors, becauſe they make no eſſential difference in the Doctrine of Salvation by Chriſt, which is the great Fundamental of Chriſtianity, as you ſhall ſee more preſently; every erroneous Doctrine does not make a new Religion, though it may in a great meaſure obſcure the Glory, or ſpoil the influence of it upon mens minds.

Vid. inf. 321.

Obſcure

4. I obſerve further, that there are ſome Doctrines, which are neceſſary to Catholick Communion, becauſe the denial of them makes an eſſential difference in Chriſtian Worſhip. Chriſtian Communion is principally exerciſed in all the Offices of Chriſtian Worſhip, and thoſe, who cannot Worſhip God together, cannot maintain Chriſtian Com-

Communion with each other. Thus the belief or denial of the ſacred Trinity, the incarnation of Chriſt, the ſatisfaction of his death, *&c.* makes an eſſential alteration in moſt of the Acts of Chriſtian Worſhip: And we ſee to this day, the very *Gloria Patri*, is an effectual bar to the *Socinians*, from joyning in our Communion. Now that which I am principally concerned for at preſent, is ſuch an account of Fundamentals, as is neceſſary to maintain Catholick Communion in the Chriſtian World. Cap. 5.

To ſtate this matter then, as plainly and briefly as I can, I ſhall 1. endeavour to fix the plain notion of fundamental Doctrines, and conſequently, of fundamental Errors. 2. I ſhall conſider the Caſe of thoſe men, who heartily believe all the fundamental Doctrines of Chriſtianity, and yet entertain ſuch corrupt Doctrines, as in their immediate and neceſſary Conſequences overthrow Foundations, and whether they may be ſaid to err Fundamentally. 3. How far, and in what Caſes, we may Communicate with ſuch men and Churches, as believe all Fundamentals, but yet profeſs ſuch other erroneous Do-

Cap. 5. Doctrines, as ſeem to overthrow Foundations. I think this is all, that is neceſſary in order to clear this point of Catholick Communion, as it reſpects Doctrines.

1. To fix the plain notion of fundamental Doctrines; now a fundamental Doctrine is ſuch a Doctrine, as is in a ſtrict ſence of the eſſence of Chriſtianity: A fundamental Doctrine, without which the whole building and ſuperſtructure muſt fall. The belief of which, is neceſſary to the very being of Chriſtianity, like the firſt principles in any Art or Science, which muſt be acknowledged, or elſe there can be no ſuch Science. Now St. *Paul* tells us, that this Foundation is Chriſt. *For other Foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jeſus Chriſt.* That is, no man can lay any other Foundation for the Chriſtian Religion; for you deſtroy the Chriſtian Religion, if you leave Chriſt out of it. And therefore the Character the ſame Apoſtle gives of Apoſtates from Chriſtianity, is that they *hold not the Head*, that is Chriſt. And St. *John* makes this the ſum of Chriſtian Faith. *Theſe are written, that ye might believe, that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God, and*

Waterland's Dic. of Fundamentals, p. 14.

1 Cor. 3. 11.

29/

1 Col. 19.

2 Joh. 31.

and that believing ye might have life through his Name. And the neceſſary qualification of an Apoſtle, was *to be a Witneſs of the Reſurrection*, as the laſt great Confirmation, which was given to our Saviours Authority; and the ſum of St. *Paul's* preaching at *Athens*, was *Jeſus and the Reſurrection*, which *the Philoſophers of the* Epicureans *and* Stoicks *miſtake for ſtrange Gods.* And the Commiſſion Chriſt gave his Apoſtles, was *to preach Repentance and remiſſion of Sins in his Name.* So that Salvation by Chriſt is the general fundamental Doctrine of the Goſpel. Take away this, and you deſtroy the eſſential Character of the Chriſtian Religion, whereby it is diſtinguiſh'd from all other Religions.

Cap. 5.

1 Act. 22.

17 Act. 18.

24 Luk. 47.

Salvation by Xt ye general fundamental Doctrine of ye Gospel.

But then as for particular Doctrines and Articles of Faith, thoſe are Fundamental, which are either neceſſarily included in, or inſeparably conjoyned with this general fundamental of Salvation by Chriſt. For we muſt not think it enough to believe in general, that Jeſus is the Chriſt the Son of God, without a more explicite underſtanding of the meaning of that Propoſition; who this Jeſus is, what it is to be the Chriſt

Cap. 5. and the Son of God, and how we are ſaved by him; and this we muſt learn from the Revelations of the Goſpel; the more neceſſary connexion there is between any particular Doctrine, and that great fundamental of Salvation by Chriſt, the more neceſſary and fundamental it is; which ſeems to me to be the trueſt and eaſieſt Character, that can be given of a fundamental Doctrine.

a fundamental Doctrine: W^t may be properly call'd ſo.

Thus far I think I am ſafe, but it may be thought a hazardous attempt to launch out any farther, or particularly to define, what thoſe particular Doctrines of Chriſtian Religion are, without which we cannot rightly believe Salvation by Chriſt. Though I cannot ſee, but that this may be done ſafely enough, if we uſe due caution in it: and I ſhall venture to offer ſomething of this nature, both to ſatisfie inquiſitive men, why ſuch and ſuch Doctrines have always been accounted fundamental by the Catholick Church, and to diſtinguiſh what is fundamental from ſome more nice and curious ſpeculations, which is of mighty uſe in the preſent diſpute about Catholick Communion.

And

And not to pretend to give a perfect Catalogue of Fundamentals, I ſhall only give a taſte of this in ſome few particulars, which have given occaſion to the fierceſt Diſputes in the Chriſtian Church. Cap. 5.

1. I ſhall begin with the Doctrine of the holy Trinity, which hath in all Ages been accounted a fundamental Article of the Chriſtian Faith, and hath as good reaſon to be thought ſo, as any other, ſince we are baptized into this belief: For to *baptize into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*, according to the moſt proper ſignification of the words, and the expoſition of the Catholick Church, ſignifies to baptize into the Faith and Worſhip of the ſacred Trinity; as I think, I could eaſily ſhew at large, were it proper upon this occaſion.

And how eſſential this belief is to the right underſtanding of the Doctrine of man's Salvation by Jeſus Chriſt, which is the comprehenſive fundamental of Chriſtian Religion, will eaſily be acknowledged by any man, who carefully conſiders, how each Perſon in the ever bleſſed Trinity is concerned in the Oeconomy of man's Salvation.

Cap. 5. The Father in infinite pity and compaſſion to fallen man, *gives his only begotten Son, that whoſoever believes in him, might not periſh, but have everlaſting Life*: He gives him to become man, and to die as a Sacrifice for ſin, and to ſeal a Covenant of Grace and Mercy in his blood.

The Son moved by the ſame love and pity, gives himſelf, becomes man, dies for the attonement and expiation of our ſins; riſes again from the dead, and takes poſſeſſion of his mediatory Kingdom, becomes the Lord and Judge both of the quick and the dead; and according to his promiſe ſends his Spirit upon his Apoſtles in miraculous gifts and powers, to qualifie them for the work of the Miniſtry; and beſtows the ſame holy Spirit upon the whole Chriſtian Church, and every ſincere member of it, as an abiding principle of Sanctification, and a new Life.

The holy Spirit accordingly comes, and dwells in his Church, and in good men, as in his Temple, ſanctifies them in this World to be veſſels of Honour, and will hereafter raiſe their dead bodies into immortal Life.

So

So that each Person in the Sacred Trinity is peculiarly concerned in the Salvation of Mankind; and we cannot truly believe the great fundamental Doctrine of Salvation by Christ, without the belief of the holy Trinity, of Father, Son, and holy Ghost, one eternal and infinite God. Cap. 5.

The God-head of the Father is acknowledged by all, but whoever denies the Godhead of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, overthrows the whole Doctrine of Salvation by Christ, as it is taught in the new Testament, and makes it quite another thing, and a very little thing too; as to shew this briefly. Waterland's Disc. of Fundamentals, p. 18.

He who makes Christ to be either the most excellent Creature, as the *Arians* did, or a meer man, as the *Socinians* do, mightily lessen the Grace and goodness of God to sinners, which is represented as such a stupendious act of Love, *that God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son*: now if this *only begotten Son*, be only the most glorious and excellent Creature, especially if he be but a meer man, the love and the design is not so stupendious and astonishing; for God has an equal propriety in all his Creatures, and it is no such 283

Cap. 5. prizing Myſtery, that a good God ſhould give one of his Creatures, though never ſo excellent, eſpecially if he be but one excellent man, for the redemption of ſo many Millions; eſpecially when he promiſes to reward this undertaking with ſuch a ſuperexcellent degree of Glory and Power. The love of God in redeeming us, by what means ſoever, is very great; but his love in giving *his only begotten Son* for our redemption, where Chriſt himſelf lays the emphaſis, if this only begotten Son be but a Creature or a man, is not ſo wonderful.

Thus it ſounds very oddly, for a Creature to be the Saviour of mankind, to be the object of a religious Faith, and Hope, and Truſt, and Dependance: The Worſhip of Chriſt cannot be divine Worſhip, if he be not God, and a *made God* is a contradiction in the terms, unleſs we mean only a titular God, and a titular God, cannot be the Object of Religious Worſhip. It is unintelligible, how the blood of a Creature can make a proper atonement and expiation for ſin, and therefore the *Socinians*, who deny Chriſt to be God, are very conſiſtent with themſelves in denying

ing his ſatisfaction: A Creature is not capable of infinite and omnipotent Power, no more than a finite Nature, (as the moſt excellent created Nature is) can be the Subject of infinite perfections; and therefore if Chriſt be not God, he cannot have all Power in Heaven and Earth committed to him; he cannot have it in his own Perſon, becauſe he is not capable of it, and cannot exerciſe it: He can at moſt only bear the name, but the Government of the World, muſt be in another hand, which is able to manage it. Cap. 5.

Let us then now conſider, what a fundamental difference the denyal of the divinity of our Saviour makes in the Doctrine of Salvation by Chriſt, which I ſhall repreſent by drawing two Schemes of the Doctrine of Salvation, one proceeding upon the belief of the Divinity of our Saviour, the other upon ſuppoſition, that he is only an excellent Creature, or meer man.

Chriſt the eternal Son of God.

1. God out of infinite love to fallen man, gave his eternal and only begotten Son to be our Saviour.

2. This eternal Son of God in the fulneſs of time, appeared in the World in humane nature, preached the Goſpel, confirmed his Authority by miracles, which he wrought by his own divine Power, purchaſed and redeemed his Church by his own Blood, by which he made a full and perfect expiation for our ſins, and ſealed the Covenant of Grace and Pardon.

Chriſt an excellent Creature, or meer man.

1. *God ſent his moſt excellent Creature, or created a moſt excellent man to redeem ſinners.*

2. *This glorious and excellent Creature, or this excellent man, was at the prefixt time born into the World, and preached the Goſpel, and God confirmed his Authority, as he did the Authority of other great Prophets, by Miracles; and when he was perſecuted for it, he owned the truth to the very death, and ſet a great example of conſtancy, and patience, and ſubmiſſion to God in his ſufferings; as other great Prophets had done before him, though not in ſo extraordinary a manner.*

3. This

3. This incarnate God according to his promiſe, on the third day raiſed himſelf from the dead by his own divine Power; and took poſſeſſion of his mediatory Kingdom, as the reward and the purchaſe of his death.

3. *This crucified Jeſus was raiſed by God from the dead the third day, though being but a Creature or a Man, he was not able to raiſe himſelf; and was advanced by God to great Power and Glory.*

4. Which conſiſts in his Power to forgive ſins, as a Prieſt, in vertue of his Sacrifice offered on the Croſs; to give Commiſſion to his Apoſtles to preach Repentance and forgiveneſs of ſins in his Name; to ſend the holy Spirit into the World; to protect his Church from all Enemies; and finally to judge the World, to raiſe the dead, to puniſh the wicked and unbelievers, and to reward his true and faithful Diſciples; and all this

4. *Which Power conſiſts in all thoſe Acts which are ſpecified in the oppoſite Scheme, with this difference, that his Power is not owing to his Prieſthood or Sacrifice, nor has any dependance on it, but he is a Saviour, forgives ſins,* &c. *by a Soveraign Power given him by God, not by Merit or Purchaſe, or the expiation of his Sacrifice: And there is this contradiction in it, that a Creature is inveſted with Almighty Power; and this riddle in it, that God ſhould make a Creature*

by his own Power and Authority, inherent in himſelf, though receiv-ed from his Father.

ture the Saviour of mankind, and this Blaſphemy, that God ſhould advance a Creature to be his own Rival or Partner in divine Honour.

This ſhort account makes it very evident, what a fundamental difference the belief or denial of the Divinity of our Saviour, makes in the whole Doctrine of Salvation by Chriſt. The firſt makes it an Act of ſtupendious love in God, in giving his own Son to be a Propitiation for our ſins; the ſecond is a great act of love in ſaving ſinners, but the manner is not ſo full of Wonder, and myſterious Goodneſs. The firſt makes it an act of infinite Love and Condeſcention in Chriſt to become Man, a Miniſter and a Servant, and to ſubmit to an accurſed death for our ſakes. *That though he were rich, yet for our ſakes he became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich*: But the ſecond infers no ſuch thing, as I can ſee: If he were nothing greater than a man, it was no condeſcention in him to be made a man; eſpecially if he had no being before he was born of the Virgin

gin *Mary*, it was no more matter of his choice to become man, than it is of any other man, who is born into the World; and therefore could be no Act of Love or Condeſcenſion. Cap. 5.

Nay, ſuppoſe that Chriſt were the moſt glorious and excellent Creature, yet being a Creature, there is not ſuch a vaſt difference between the moſt perfect Creature and a perfect Man, as there is between a God, and the moſt perfect Creature; it is no ſuch mighty debaſement for the moſt glorious Angels to appear in puré and untainted Fleſh and Blood; eſpecially upon ſuch a glorious deſign as the redemption of mankind: Though the diſguiſe and appearance may be thought below an Angelical Nature, yet the Character with which he appears, as the great Prophet and Saviour of the World, is as much above it. The meaneſt ſtate and condition of humane nature, a poor deſpiſed and laborious Life, the moſt painful and ignominious death, which makes the moſt excellent Creature, the Saviour of mankind, and advances him to be Lord and Judge of the World, is ſo far from being an Act of condeſcending love in the moſt glorious Creature, that

Cap. 5. that it is above his Ambition, and would be like the pride of Lucifer, to be equal to God.

To become man, to ſuffer and die for the redemption of the World, and to be made the Lord and Judge both of the quick and of the dead, can be an act of condeſcending love and goodneſs only in God. So that to deny the Divinity of Chriſt, alters the very foundations of Chriſtianity, and deſtroys all the powerful arguments of the Love, Humility, and Condeſcention of our Lord, which are the peculiar motives of the Goſpel.

Thus the belief of the Divinity of Chriſt makes God to be our Saviour, the object of our Faith, and Hope, and Relyance; the denial of it makes a Creature to be our Saviour, and the object of a Religious Faith and Worſhip; which I think differ as much, as the Worſhip of God, and of a Creature. The firſt contains a viſible union of our Nature to the Deity, which is a viſible demonſtration of God's love and tender regard to mankind; the ſecond deprives us of this ſenſible Conſolation.

The

The first exhibits to us a Saviour by Purchase and by Redemption, which is both more endearing, and a greater security to our guilty fears; the second makes Christ a Saviour, only as a Prophet or a King may be a Saviour, who saves by wise instructions, by preaching the way of Salvation, or by Power. Cap. 5.

The first respects the guilt of sin, and the just Wrath and Displeasure of God, which is the Object of our guilty fears. It offers a Saviour to us, who is a Mediator between God and man, and powerfully intercedes for our Pardon in vertue of his meritorious Sacrifice; The second has no respect to the atonement and reconciliation of God, which is the only security to a guilty Conscience, but only contains proposals of Peace and Reconciliation without a Sacrifice: A thing which mankind will not easily believe, when they are thorowly convinced of the evil of sin, and the inflexible purity and holiness of the divine Nature; not to take notice now, how irreconcileable this is with all the ancient Types of the Law of *Moses*.

In a word, he who believes Christ to be perfect God, as well as perfect man, is easily satisfied of his Power to save, as well 275

Cap. 5. well as of the Vertue of his Sacrifice. For omnipotent Power is eſſential to the Notion of a God, and when God becomes our Saviour, he can exerciſe all that Power, which is neceſſary to our Salvation; but he who believes Chriſt to be but an exalted Creature, can never underſtand how he can exercise omnipotent Power, which is peculiar to God: For I think it is ſomewhat harder to underſtand, how a Creature can be made a God, and be poſſeſt of divine Perfections, ſuch as omnipotent Power is, than to believe, that God can take a Creature into a perſonal union with himſelf.

This, I think, is ſufficient to ſatisfie any man, what a fundamental Change the denial of Chriſt's Divinity makes in the Doctrine of Salvation by Chriſt. It makes a new Goſpel and a new Religion; and therefore the Divinity of Chriſt muſt be acknowledged to be a fundamental Doctrine, becauſe the denial of it ſubverts Foundations.

Thus to proceed, our Salvation by Chriſt does not only conſiſt in the expiation of our ſins, and the propoſal of terms of Reconciliation, and the promiſe of Pardon and a Reward, but in the

the Communications of divine Grace and Power to renew and ſanctifie us; and this is every where in Scripture attributed to the holy Spirit, as his peculiar Office in the Oeconomy of man's Salvation; and it muſt make a fundamental change in the Doctrine of divine Grace and aſſiſtance, to deny the Divinity of the holy Spirit. For can a Creature be the univerſal Spring and Fountain of divine Grace and Life? Can a finite Creature be a kind of univerſal Soul to the whole Chriſtian Church, and to every ſincere member of it? Can a Creature make ſuch cloſe Applications to our minds, know our thoughts, ſet bounds to our Paſſions, inſpire us with new affections and deſires, and be more intimate to us, than we are to our ſelves? If a Creature be the only inſtrument and principle of Grace, we ſhall ſoon be tempted, either to deny the grace of God, or to make it only an external thing, and entertain very mean conceits of it. All thoſe miraculous gifts, which were beſtowed on the Apoſtles and primitive Chriſtians for the edification of the Church, were the gifts of the Spirit, all the graces of the Chriſtian Life, are the fruits of the Spirit.

Cap. 5.

Waterland's Diſc. of Fundamentals, p. 21.

Cap. 5. rit. The divine Spirit is the principle of Immortality in us, which first gives life to our Souls, and will at the last day raise our dead bodies out of the dust, works which sufficiently proclaim him to be God, and which we cannot heartily believe in the Gospel-notion of them, if he be not.

Thus, we see, how fundamental the doctrine of the ever blessed Trinity is in the Christian Religion, because we cannot rightly understand the Doctrine of Salvation, nor the Covenant of Grace, without this belief; which seems to be the true reason, why the more perfect discovery of this was reserved for Gospel-times, and only obscurely hinted under the Law, because the peculiar use of it is under the Gospel; each sacred Person having a peculiar interest and concernment in the work of our Redemption. And therefore all those, who expresly deny the Divinity of the Son, and of the holy Spirit, as many ancient Hereticks did of old, and as the *Socinians* do at this day, do err fundamentally, however God may be merciful to their ignorance or prejudice, which it does not concern us to meddle with.

253, 312

But

But though it is neceſſary and eſſential to the Chriſtian Faith, to acknowledg Father, Son, and holy Ghoſt to be one eternal God, yet there are a great many little ſubtilties ſtarted by over-curious and buſie heads, which are not fundamental Doctrines, and ought not to be thought ſo: God forbid that all the nice diſtinctions and definitions of the Schools, about Eſſence, Subſiſtence, Perſonalty, about eternal Generation and Proceſſion, the difference between Filiation, and Spiration, *&c.* ſhould be reckon'd among Fundamentals of our Faith: For though we underſtood nothing of theſe matters (as indeed we don't, and it had been happy the Church had never heard of them) yet if we believe the Divinity of each Perſon, we believe enough to underſtand the Doctrine of Salvation. Cap. 5.

And though that fatal Diſpute between the *Greek* and *Latine* Church about the Filioque, be of more importance than ſuch Scholaſtick ſubtilties, yet I cannot ſee, that it concerns the foundation of our Faith. For the *Greek* Church did firmly believe the holy Spirit to be true God, though they would

Cap. 5. not own, that he proceeded from the Father, and the Son, but from the Father only: And though we muſt acknowledg this to be a miſtake, yet it is not a fundamental miſtake; for the Doctrine of Salvation is ſecured by believing the holy Spirit to be true God, without defining the manner of his Proceſſion.

2. Upon the ſame account that the Doctrine of the ſacred Trinity is a fundamental Article of our Faith, the Doctrine of Chriſt's Incarnation alſo, and what he did and ſuffered in order to our Salvation, the meritorious Sacrifice of his death, his Reſurrection from the dead, Aſſenſion into Heaven, Interceſſion for us at God's right hand, and that he ſhall come again to judge the World, to reward his faithful Diſciples with a glorious Reſurrection, and eternal Life, and to puniſh the wicked with eternal Death, muſt be reckoned alſo among the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity, becauſe we cannot rightly underſtand, nor rightly believe the Doctrine of Salvation by Chriſt, without a belief of theſe Matters.

This

This is ſo obvious at the firſt propoſal, that I need not inſiſt on the Proof of it: And therefore thoſe who deny Chriſt to be true and perfect man, as well as thoſe who deny him to be God, err fundamentally, for he could not die for us, nor expiate our ſins by his blood, if he were not man. Cap. 5.

As for the *Modus* of this Hypoſtatical union, how the divine and humane nature are united in Chriſt, it muſt be acknowledged to be very unconceivable by us, and it is no great wonder it ſhould be ſo, when we do not perfectly underſtand any one ſort of natural union, not ſo much as how the parts of matter hang together, much leſs how the Soul and Body is united to make one man. But yet it is fundamental to the Chriſtian Faith to believe, that the divine and humane nature are united in Chriſt, that the ſame Chriſt is both perfect God, and perfect man, or we muſt err fundamentally in the Doctrine of Salvation by Chriſt; for neither God nor man diſtinctly and ſeparately conſidered, can be our Saviour according to the Goſpel-notion of Salvation. God cannot ſuffer and die, and the death of a man cannot expiate ſin, nor his Pow- 269

Cap. 5. er ſave us; and therefore we muſt acknowledg, that God and man is ſo united in Chriſt, that the Actions and operations of each nature do as properly belong to one Chriſt, as the diſtinct Operations of Body and Soul, are the actions of the ſame man.

Upon this account, the Catholick Church condemned the Hereſies of *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches*. For *Neſtorius* divided not only the Natures, but the Perſons in Chriſt, only united them in Authority and Dignity: And thus Chriſt was not an Incarnate God in one Perſon; but the Man Chriſt was taken into a nearer relation to the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity, than any other Man or Creature is, but not ſo as to become one with him; which deſtroyes the Myſtery of our Redemption by the Blood of God: For whatever Dignity and Honour were conferr'd upon the man Chriſt by his relation to the λόγος, or divine Word, yet his Blood was not the Blood of God, becauſe notwithſtanding this Relation to God the Son, he remained as much a diſtinct Perſon and Subſiſtence, as any other man is.

Act. 20. 28.

The

The Hereſie of *Eutyches* is certainly equally dangerous; for he ran ſo far from the *Neſtorian* Hereſie of two Perſons, that he denyed two natures in Chriſt: He did not deny, but that there was a humane and divine nature before their union, but he aſſerted ſuch an union of natures in Chriſt, as made a mixture and confuſion of natures: That Chriſt did not remain perfect God and perfect man, after this union, but the humane and divine natures were ſo blended together, as to become one nature, as well as one Perſon: And therefore he denyed the very Body of Chriſt to be of the ſame nature with our Bodies, or ſubject to the ſame paſſions; nay, he aſſerts the divine nature it ſelf to be paſſible. And I think, I need not ſhew, how this overthrows the fundamental Doctrine of Salvation by Chriſt, which proves it to be a fundamental Hereſie. Cap. 5.

Ἐγὼ μὲν ἐκ δύο φύσεων ὁμολογῶ γεγονέναι τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἕνωσιν μίαν φύσιν αὐτὸν εἶναι

χηρύττων καὶ τὸ θεῖον αὐτοῦ σῶμα μὴ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν, καὶ ὁμοιοπαθὲς καθεστάναι. Niceph. Caliſt. *l.* 14. καὶ παθητὸν καὶ θνητὸν. *Id. l.* 15. *cap.* 6.

I ſhall only obſerve that *Leo* Biſhop of *Rome* in his Letter to *Flavian*, (who was then Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, and was afterwards murdered by the *Eutychian*

Et ad resolvendum conditionis nostræ debitum, naturæ inviolabilis naturæ est unita passibili, ut quod nostris remediis congruebat, mediator Dei & hominum homo Jesus Christus, & mori posset ex uno, & non mori posset ex altero. Leo ep. ad Flavian.

chian Faction in the packt Council of *Ephesus*) confutes the Hereſie of *Eutyches* from the very Principle, on which I have all along proceeded, becauſe it deſtroys the Doctrine of Salvation by Chriſt. For ſays he, to diſcharge the debt and obligation of our lapſed State; a nature which cannot ſuffer, is united to a nature, which can: That ſo as our Redemption required the Mediator between God and man; the man Chriſt Jeſus might be capable of ſuffering and dying as man, and exempted from all poſſibility of dying as God.

This I think is ſufficient to ſhew, how fundamental the belief of the ſacred Trinity, and the Incarnation of our Saviour is in the Chriſtian Religion; Salvation by Chriſt is a fundamental Doctrine, or nothing is fundamental in the Chriſtian Faith; and yet the Doctrine of Salvation by Chriſt is neceſſarily founded on the belief of the holy Trinity, each ſacred Perſon being peculiarly concerned in the Oeconomy of
306 man's Salvation. And I confeſs, it does mightily confirm me in this way of ſta-

ting

ting the notion of Fundamentals, that it does ſo plainly diſcover the neceſſity of that Faith, which has always been accounted ſacred and inviolable by the Catholick Church: This is the Faith we are baptized into, according to our Saviours Command, *to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* Cap. 5.

This is the ſum of all the ancient Creeds: The Apoſtles Creed being little elſe than the explication of the form of Baptiſm, what we are to believe of God the Father, what of God the Son, and what of God the Holy Ghoſt. And when Hereticks aroſe, who corrupted this Faith, the Catholick Church expreſſed greater Zeal in nothing, than in preſerving this Faith pure and ſincere: This was the occaſion of the firſt general Councils, wherein *Arius*, *Neſtorius*, *Eutyches*, *Macedonius*, and ſuch other Hereticks were condemned: This occaſioned the *Nicene*, *Conſtantinopolitan*, and the *Athanaſian* Creeds, which contain only the Catholick expoſition of the Doctrine of the Trinity, in oppoſition to theſe ancient Hereſies. And it would be very ſtrange, if that which is the chief, nay almoſt the only Subject of all

Cap. 5. our Creeds, ſhould not be thought a fundamental of our Religion. And yet it is as ſtrange, that it ſhould be a fundamental, if it be only an abſtruſe and difficult ſpeculation, which is of no other uſe, nor valuable upon any other account than pure Orthodoxy; which is the only reaſon that can be aſſigned, why any men, who believe the Doctrine of the Trinity, ſhould not expreſs a great and warm Zeal for it, becauſe they do not obſerve, how the whole Goſpel-Doctrine of Salvation by Chriſt depends on it: The end of Chriſtian Faith is a holy Life, and if men may lead a very holy Life without the belief of the Trinity, ſome think, this Faith cannot be abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation; but now this muſt be a great and dangerous miſtake, though we ſhould ſuppoſe, that men may live very holily without the belief of the Trinity, unleſs we ſuppoſe alſo, that a holy Life will carry men to Heaven without Faith in Chriſt, or Salvation by him, for we cannot rightly believe in Chriſt for Salvation without this Faith.

And thus I might ſhut up the Doctrine of Fundamentals; for indeed I know nothing ſtrictly fundamental in the

the Chriſtian Religion, but the Doctrine of the holy Trinity, and the ſeveral Acts and Offices, if I may ſo ſpeak, of each ſacred Perſon in the Oeconomy of man's Salvation, which I have already briefly hinted: But having entred upon a Diſcourſe of ſuch vaſt Importance, to give the greater ſatisfaction to inquiſitive men, I ſhall venture one ſtep further, and I think no man need go any further. Cap. 5.

3. The next inquiry therefore ſhall be, what is fundamental in the Doctrine of Salvation it ſelf. Now this our Saviour briefly comprehends in that Commiſſion he gave to the Apoſtles, *to preach Repentance and Forgiveneſs of ſins in his Name*: i. e. to preach forgiveneſs of ſins to all true Penitents through Faith in his Name, or *through Faith in his Blood*, as St. *Paul* expounds it. Luke 24. 47. Rom. 3. 24, 25.

Now not to diſpute this point at preſent with the *Socinians*, all who believe that Chriſt died to make atonement for our ſins, muſt acknowledg the atonement and expiation of Chriſts death to be a fundamental Article of the Chriſtian Faith, whereon the Doctrine of ſalvation by Chriſt is built: For therefore he is our Saviour, becauſe he ſaves his People

Cap. 5. People from their ſins, and how this is, we are often told, *viz.* by dying for our ſins, the juſt for the unjuſt, that he may reconcile us to God.

Now if this be true (as I ſhall at preſent take for granted) then it muſt be a fundamental Doctrine, upon theſe two accounts; 1. Becauſe the belief or the denial of the atonement of Chriſt's death, makes a ſpecifical change in Religion. A Religion with a Sacrifice, and a Religion without a Sacrifice differ in the whole kind; the firſt reſpects the atonement of our paſt ſins, and our daily infirmities; it reſpects God, as the Judge and avenger of wickedneſs, as well as the rewarder of thoſe, who diligently ſeek him; the other is a kind of
87 Philoſophical inſtitution to train men up in the practice of Piety and Vertue: That is, a Religion without a Sacrifice is at moſt but half as much as a Religion with a Sacrifice; and that half wherein they agree of a quite different nature from each other. That Religion which requires an expiatory Sacrifice, to make atonement for ſin, and to obtain the Pardon of it, does alſo ſtrictly enjoyn the practice of an univerſal Righteouſneſs, which is the whole of a

Waterland's Dyc. of Fundamentals, p. 20.

Re-

Religion without a Sacrifice. And yet this practical part of Religion is vaſtly altered by the belief or denial of the Sacrifice and expiation of Chriſt's death. Cap. 5.

Thoſe who deny the death of Chriſt to be an expiatory Sacrifice for the ſins of the World, may pay all that Homage and Worſhip to God, which is due to the great Creator and Benefactor of mankind, and may obſerve all the duties of moral Righteouſneſs; but there are ſome new Acts of Religious Worſhip, or ſome new inſtances of Duty, or new degrees and reſpects of Vertue, which neceſſarily reſult from the expiation of Chriſt's death, which either cannot be obſerved at all, or not in their true meaning and ſignification by thoſe who deny it; as to give ſome few inſtances of it.

The love of God as our Redeemer and Saviour, who gave his own Son for our Ranſom, to die for our ſins, and to make atonement and expiation by his Blood, is very different from the love of God as our Creator, and Benefactor, nay as our Redeemer by Covenant, Promiſe, and Power; it is a more tranſporting and ſenſible Paſſion, and the peculiar Worſhip of the Goſpel, which 261

Cap. 5. which thoſe cannot give to God, who deny the expiation of Chriſt's death.

The Worſhip of a God Incarnate, a God in our nature and likeneſs, a God, who is our Saviour, Mediator and Advocate through his own Blood, vaſtly differs from the Worſhip of a pure, infinite, eternal Spirit, or from the Worſhip of an exalted Creature. And this is the peculiar Worſhip of the Lord's Supper, that great and venerable Myſtery of our Religion, which is a thin and empty Ceremony without it.

To pray to God in the Name and Mediation of Chriſt, and in vertue of his Sacrifice, vaſtly differs from a natural hope and truſt in God's mercy, or in his bare promiſe, or in the Power and Intereſt of a great Favourite, though appointed to be our Mediator, not in vertue of his Sacrifice, but by Royal Favour: Not but that God's Promiſe of Pardon and acceptance confirmed to us by ſuch a powerful Favourite, whom God himſelf hath appointed to be our Advocate, may give us ſufficient ſecurity, that God will hear and anſwer our Prayers; but this aſſurance is of a different nature from the vertue of a Sacrifice, and affects our minds in a different man-

manner, and excites different Paſſions, and very different acts of Devotion, and makes our Worſhip differ as much, as a Mediator by Sacrifice does from a Mediator by Intereſt and Power. Cap. 5.

As for the other parts of Religion, which concern our Converſation with men, or the Government of our own Appetites and Paſſions, there ſeems to be ſome new inſtances, or new degrees of Vertue, which have a neceſſary dependance on the Sacrifice of Chriſt's death, as the example or reaſon of them. As that high degree of brotherly love which Chriſt requires of us, as the Badg of our Diſcipleſhip, to love one another, as he hath loved us, to forgive one another even as God for Chriſt's ſake hath forgiven us; all Acts of kindneſs and charity to our poor Brethren, as knowing the Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, that though he were rich, yet for your ſakes he became poor, that you through his poverty may be rich, the force and prevalency of which example, and of which reaſon, I think is greatly abated by denying the expiation of Chriſt's death. However I think it is very plain, that the true principle of Goſpel-obedience, that which makes Joh. 13. 35. 1 Joh. 4. 9.

all

Cap. 5. all our actions in a ſtrict and proper ſence Chriſtian Graces and Vertues, has a neceſſary reſpect to the expiation of Chriſt's death: We muſt cheerfully obey the Will of God, not only conſidered as our Creator, but as a Redeemer; we muſt give up our ſelves to Chriſt, as the purchaſe of his Blood, for *we are not our own, but bought with a price, and therefore muſt glorifie God both with our Bodies, and with our Spirits, which are God's*; we muſt yield our ſelves willing Captives to the conquering and conſtraining Power of his Love: *the Love of Chriſt conſtrains us, for we thus judg, that if Chriſt dyed for all, then were all dead, and that he dyed for us, that we who live, might not henceforth live unto our ſelves, but unto him, who dyed for us.* If Chriſt did not redeem and purchaſe us by his Blood, all this ſignifies nothing; it is all but Phraſe, and Metaphor, and Alluſion, which cannot form a principle of Action: And yet the Apoſtles of Chriſt do not ſo much inſiſt on the Authority of God, as our Maker and Governor, as on his purchaſe as Redeemer, on the love of our dying Lord, who is our Prieſt, our Sacrifice, and Mediator; and were it poſſible to obey

Sup. 99.

1 Cor. 6. 19, 20.

2 Cor. 5. 14, 15.

obey the Gospel without any regard to the redemption of Christ, and that stupendious love of God in it, it were not true Evangelical obedience, no more than it is obedience to God, to do what he commands for some private end and reason of our own, without any regard to his Authority and Government. Cap. 5.

So that whether the Doctrine of the atonement and satisfaction of Christ's death be true or false, it is certainly fundamental either way, either a fundamental Article of Faith, or a fundamental Error, because it alters Foundations, and changes the whole frame of Christian Religion. If Christ have made atonement and expiation for our sins, Christianity is one thing, if he have not, it is quite another thing, as different, as it is possible; which I think is a plain argument, that the expiation of Christ's Blood is a fundamental or foundation-Doctrine, since the whole Fabrick of Christian Religion, as it is taught in the Gospel, is built on it.

2. There is one consideration more, which will confirm this, that the atonement and expiation of Christ's death is a fundamental Doctrine, because the Blood of Christ, that is, the expiation of

Cap. 5. of his Blood, is the peculiar object of justifying Faith; now certainly that must be fundamental, which is essential to justifying Faith. Salvation or Justification by Christ being the sum of the Gospel, whatever is essential to justifying Faith, is certainly a fundamental Doctrine of Christianity, if there be any such thing as Fundamentals.

Repentance in its full Extent and Latitude, as it includes not only a sorrow for our past sins, but the reformation of our lives, and an actual obedience to all the Laws of the Gospel, is a necessary condition of our Pardon and Justification, or necessarily required in those, whom God will justifie: But Repentance and a new Life cannot justifie us: No Religion, that ever was in the World, taught men certainly to expect Pardon of sin meerly upon their Repentance: And it is plain, that mankind never did; for both Heathens and Jews thought the expiation of Sacrifices as necessary, and more prevalent than meer Repentance, to obtain their Pardon: And the reason why God hath appointed us no Sacrifice but a broken heart, or the living Sacrifice of an obedient Soul and Body, to offer to him,

him, is becauſe he has provided an ex- Cap. 5.
piatory Sacrifice himſelf, hath given his
own Son to be a Sacrifice for us; and
the Pardon of our ſins is every where
attributed to the death of Chriſt, as the
meritorious Cauſe. But then as Chriſt
hath dyed for our ſins, and redeemed
us with his Blood, and God for Chriſt's
ſake will pardon and juſtifie all repent-
ing ſinners, ſo we muſt conſider, that
meer repentance can no more apply or
appropiate the Sacrifice and Expiation
of Chriſt's death to us for our Pardon,
than it can juſtifie us without a Sacri-
fice: That is the peculiar Office of Faith
in Chriſt, or Faith in his Blood: as St.
Paul expreſly tells us. *Being juſtified* Rom. 3.
freely by his Grace, through the redemp- 24, 25.
tion which is in Chriſt Jeſus, whom God
hath ſet forth to be a Propitiation through
Faith in his Blood. For though Faith
in Chriſt is very often uſed in a very
large ſence for the whole Goſpel of our
Saviour, and to comprehend all Acts of
Obedience and a holy Life, as the Prin-
ciple from whence they flow, and no
other is true juſtifying Faith, but that
which includes Obedience and a holy
Life: Yet ſometimes Faith is diſtin-
guiſht from Repentance and a holy Life,

Cap. 5. and ſo has Chriſt, and in a peculiar manner his Blood, for its Object. Thus the ſum of St. *Paul*'s preaching was *Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*: And the Commiſſion Chriſt gave to his Apoſtles, was, *to preach Repentance and Remiſſion of ſins in his Name*; that is, through Faith in his Name: So that Faith in Chriſt is diſtinguiſht from Repentance in the work of Juſtification; and ſo denotes a particular reſpect to the expiation of Chriſt's death, as the meritorious Cauſe of Pardon.

Act. 20. 21

Luke 24. 47.

Under the Law, a Sacrifice was available only for thoſe, for whom it was offer'd, but under the Goſpel inſtead of offering a Sacrifice to God, we muſt believe in that Sacrifice, which is already offered, which does particularly apply the merit and vertue of it to our ſelves, as the Oblation of the Sacrifice did under the Law; for if we would have Chriſt for our Saviour, or have any intereſt in the expiation of his death, we muſt chooſe him for our Saviour by Faith in his Blood. For I cannot ſee, but why Repentance may be as well accepted from us without a Sacrifice, as without reſpect and relation to a Sacrifice,

fice, and yet the only thing, that can entitle our Repentance in particular to the vertue of Christ's Sacrifice, is Faith in his Blood, which, I think, is a plain argument, that the atonement of Christ's death is a fundamental Doctrine of Christianity, becauſe it is eſſential to a juſtifying Faith. Cap. 5.

But then there are a great many other opinions relating to the atonement and ſatisfaction of Christ's death, which are true or falſe, but not fundamental: For as St. *Paul* obſerves, the Foundation is Christ, but yet men may build upon this Foundation either *Gold and Silver, or Hay and Stubble*, that is, true or falſe Doctrines, which are of great uſe in the Christian Life, or of very dangerous conſequence; but yet while they retain the Foundation, though their works periſh, *i. e.* the ſuperſtructure of their private Opinions be condemned and rejected, yet they themſelves may eſcape, though with great difficulty, *ſo as by fire.* 1 Cor. 3. 11. 256

Thus while men heartily believe, that Chriſt dyed for our ſins, and has made expiation for them by his Blood, and expect the Pardon of their ſins only in Chriſt's Name, that is, in vertue of his

Cap. 5. Sacrifice and Interceſſion, they may fall into great miſtakes about the Nature, Extent, and Application of this Sacrifice, and yet not err Fundamentally, though their Errors may be dangerous, and always are ſo, when they betray them to ſin.

Of this Nature I reckon ſome of thoſe unhappy Diſputes, which have torn and divided the Church in theſe late days of Liberty and Confuſion. Whether Chriſt bore our ſins, or only the puniſhment of ſin, whether he were the greateſt ſinner, or only the greateſt Sacrifice for ſin: Whether he ſuffered the ſame Puniſhments, which all ſinners ſhould have ſuffered, had they been damned for their ſins, or ſuffered that which was equivalent to it, and which God accepted for a complete and perfect ſatisfaction. Whether the expiation of Chriſt's death was ſo abſolutely neceſſary to the Pardon of our ſins, that God could not forgive ſin without it, or whether God chooſe this way, as moſt agreeable to the wiſe methods of Government, and the moſt glorious Illuſtration of all his Attributes. Whether the death of Chriſt made ſatisfaction to a natural vindictive Juſtice, and was paid to God,

God, as the offended Party, or as the Governor of the World. Whether Chriſt made a general atonement for ſin, or ſatisfied only for the ſins of the Elect; whether all the ſins of the Elect were actually laid upon Chriſt from Eternity, and actually pardoned before they were committed, or whether they are pardoned in time, when we repent and believe. Whether what Chriſt ſuffered for us, is ſo imputed to us, as if we our ſelves had done it; which makes the greateſt ſinners perfectly Innocent, and looked upon by God, as never to have ſinned, or whether it be imputed to us only for our Pardon and Juſtification. Whether the active as well as paſſive Obedience of Chriſt be imputed to us for Juſtification. Cap. 5.

Theſe and ſuch like Doctrines, ſome of which are of a very dangerous nature, and a great ſtate of temptation, yet are not fundamental Errors, becauſe they do not deſtroy the Foundation, the atonement and ſatisfaction of Chriſt's death is acknowledged on all hands, though ſome of theſe Doctrines do greatly obſcure the grace of God, and his ſtupendious wiſdom in the redemption of the World by Jeſus Chriſt, and there-

Cap. 5. fore must be reckon'd as Hay and Stubble built upon the Foundation, which will prove a great loss and dammage to such Builders, when every man's work comes to be tryed.

But to proceed; among the fundamental Doctrines of Salvation by Christ, we must reckon, not only the atonement and expiation of his death, but the gift of his holy Spirit to renew and sanctifie us: For this makes him a complete Saviour, to deliver us from the punishment of our sins, and from the power and dominion of them.

Waterland's Dyc. of Fundamentals, p. 21.

Now that it is fundamental to the Christian Religion, and to the Doctrine of Salvation by Christ, to believe the divine influences and assistances of the holy Spirit to work Faith, and all other Christian graces in us, appears from these considerations.

1. The gift of the holy Spirit is the most glorious effect of Christ's Power and Intercession, and therefore one of the principal fruits and benefits of his Sacrifice; by which we may understand the value and necessity of it; to deny the intercession of Christ, whereby he daily dispenses and applyes the merits of his Sacrifice, does as much alter the Doctrine

ſtrine of Salvation by Chriſt, as to deny the atonement of his death, and to deny the aſſiſtances of the divine Spirit, is in effect to deny his Interceſſion, of which the Communications of divine Life and Power is the principal part. Cap. 5.

2. To deny the aſſiſtances of the holy Spirit, turns the Goſpel into a meer external Miniſtration, which makes as fundamental a difference in the Chriſtian Religion, as there is between the Miniſtration of the Letter and of the Spirit.

3. This in a great meaſure takes away the Office of the holy Spirit in the Oeconomy of man's Salvation, and conſequently deſtroyes his Worſhip, which is peculiar to the Chriſtian Religion. The light of nature directs us only to the Worſhip of one God, the Chriſtian Religion conſecrates us at our baptiſm, to the Worſhip of three divine Perſons, and one God. For ſince each ſacred Perſon is peculiarly concerned in the Salvation of ſinners, each of them ought to be acknowledged and adored by us. But whoever denies the efficacy of the holy Spirit in the work of Salvation, deſtroys the foundation of his Worſhip too, conſidered as a diſtinct Perſon in the Trinity.

Cap. 5. 4. To deny the assistances of the holy Spirit, makes the Sacraments of the Christian Religion, meer external Ceremonies, which were instituted as the Ministries and Conveyances of Grace, and so makes a fundamental change in the Institutions of Christianity.

105

5. Nay it makes a fundamental change in the Worship of God, and of our Saviour. The Christian Worship principally consists, in praising God and our Saviour for spiritual mercies, in ascribing the glory of all the good we do to his free Grace, and continual succors, in begging his holy Spirit, and the constant supplies of Grace, that we may increase and persevere in all goodness; this we have frequent examples of in the Writings of the Apostles; but whoever denies the assistances of supernatural Grace, both defrauds God of his Glory, and himself of the benefit and comfort of it. He cannot praise God for, nor beg that of God, which he believes, God does not give; which makes our Worship very defective, and deprives us of the assistances of Grace, which we shall never have, if we never ask.

But

But then all, that I can judge fundamental in this point, is, that the beginnings, progreſs, and perfection of all Chriſtian graces and vertues, are owing to the influences and operations of the holy Spirit. But thoſe other nice diſputes about the manner of the Spirits working in us, whether it be a natural or moral efficacy, whether it be a ſufficient, or efficacious Grace, reſiſtable or irreſiſtable, how the operation of the Spirit is reconcileable with the freedom of humane actions; whether the habits of grace be immediately infuſed, or acquired by frequent Acts, theſe I ſay, and ſuch like Diſputes are not fundamental; for though it is of great moment for the government of our lives, which of theſe we believe, yet the Foundation which is the aſſiſtance of the divine Spirit, is ſecured either way, and all that men are to look to is, that they do not entertain ſuch ill notions of God's Grace, as ſhall make them ſecure and careleſs of a holy Life. Cap. 5.

All that I can think neceſſary to add more concerning the Doctrine of Salvation by Chriſt, is what I have already ſufficiently hinted, the neceſſity of Repentance and a holy Life. There are,

Cap. 5. I confeſs, a great many dangerous Diſputes about this matter, what place Repentance and a holy Life have in the juſtification of a ſinner. And though it is of very great moment to underſtand this matter rightly, and as particularly as we can, for fear of that ill influence which ſuch miſtakes may have upon our lives, and too apparently have upon the lives of many profeſſed Chriſtians; yet I cannot think, that man errs fundamentally, who believes, that God will juſtifie and pardon none but true penitent and reformed ſinners, and that not for the ſake and merit of Repentance and good Works, but for the ſake of Chriſt, and through Faith in his Blood, though he may differ about the neceſſity of Repentance and Obedience, and what place it has in the juſtification of a ſinner. Whether it be a neceſſary Condition, or a neceſſary requiſite and Qualification, or a neceſſary concomitant and effect of Juſtification, or whether it be neceſſary only to our Salvation, but not to our Juſtification: Whether Faith juſtifie as an Inſtrument, or as a Condition, *&c.* For while Faith in Chriſt and Obedience to his Laws are both ſecured, without either derogating

gating from the Grace of God, or the Purity of the Chriſtian Religion, other miſtakes, though dangerous, when perſued to their juſt Conſequences, and when men own, and live by ſuch Conſequences, yet I hope, are very harmleſs and Innocent, when they do not corrupt mens lives, nor hinder the efficacy of the divine Grace. Cap. 5.

Thus I have given an Eſſay (and I hope it may paſs for an Eſſay) towards the Diſcovery, what are fundamental Doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion. I have ſtrictly confined my ſelf to the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity, though there are ſome principles of natural Religion, which are antecedently neceſſary to be believed, but they are more generally known and agreed in. I have had a tender regard to the weakneſſes and miſtakes of mankind, and to the enlargement of Catholick Communion, and therefore have, as far as was conſiſtent with preſerving the eſſentials of Chriſtianity, caſt moſt of our modern controverſies out of the number of Fundamentals; which, if carefully conſidered, would aſſwage that intemperate heat, with which they are managed, and more eaſily reconcile our differences; and

Cap. 5. and yet I have not rejected any Doctrine out of the number of Fundamentals, which was ever defined to be ſuch by any received general Council of the Chriſtian Church; which gives me ſome hope, that I am come pretty near the mark.

But to give ſome new light to this matter, and to prevent ſuch objections, as I can foreſee, there are ſome few things, which I ſhall further obſerve, before I proceed.

1. The firſt concerns the judgment of that truly great and learned Perſon Mr. *Joſeph Mede*. He ſeems indeed to reject this way of ſtating the *Ratio* of Fundamentals, in relation to ſome one great Fundamental Doctrine, as I have now done. For in his cenſure of Mr. *Streſo*'s Book of Fundamentals (which I have never yet ſeen) he obſerves, that he makes three ſorts of Fundamentals. The firſt *is the Fundamentum ipſum*, or the Foundation it ſelf, though what that is, he does not tell us, and therefore how far I agree with Mr. *Streſo* in that, I know not. *The other two he meaſures by their relation to it, either* à parte ante, *and ſuch he terms* ſub Fundamentales, (which by Mr. *Mede*'s cenſure I perceive

Mede's works. Epiſt. 84 to Mr. Hartlib.

perceive, did not ſtrictly belong to Chriſtianity, but either to the principles of natural Religion, or the Jewiſh State) *or à parte poſt, which may be called* ſuper Fundamentales, *which he makes ſuch as are by immediate and neceſſary conſequence deducible from the* Fundamentum ſalutis, where he obſerves, that he had inſerted ſome Doctrines of pure ſpeculation among Fundamentals, which I confeſs to be a great fault: But from this imperfect account of Mr. *Streſo's* notion, I cannot gueſs, how far my way might fall under the ſame cenſure. As for thoſe two faults, he has obſerved in Mr. *Streſo's* way, *viz.* reckoning ſuch Doctrines among the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity, as are not ſtrictly Chriſtian Doctrines, or are matters of meer ſpeculation, I have carefully avoided them both; and as for judging what particular Doctrines are fundamental to Chriſtianity, from ſome general comprehenſive Fundamental, which contains the ſum of Chriſtian Religion, that is certainly the moſt demonſtrative way that can be: For though I do not like the way of making fundamental Articles by deduction and conſequence from ſuch a Fundamental, becauſe as Mr. *Mede* ob- Cap. 5.

Cap. 5. obſerves, all men may not ſee the neceſſity of ſuch a conſequence, though it appear plain and evident to others; yet if for inſtance, the Doctrine of Salvation by Chriſt be the great fundamental Doctrine of the Goſpel (and if that be not Fundamental, I am ſure nothing is) then though every true conſequence from this Doctrine be not Fundamental, yet whatever is neceſſarily included in this Doctrine, without which we cannot rightly underſtand and believe Salvation by Chriſt, muſt be as Fundamental, as the Doctrine it ſelf is, unleſs the Letters or Words of the Article be Fundamental, but not the true ſence of it; and within theſe bounds I have kept my ſelf; I have aſſerted no Doctrine to be Fundamental, but what is neceſſary to our belief of Salvation by Chriſt, which is a very different thing from drawing fundamental conſequences.

Ib. ep. 83. Mr. *Mede* indeed aſſigns another *ratio* of fundamental Articles; in general that they be *neceſſarii cognitu & creditu ad ſalutem*, neceſſary to be known and to be believed to Salvation *ſimply and abſolutely, and therefore no Chriſtian which ſhall be ſaved, uncapable to underſtand*

ſtand them; which exactly agrees with me, who make only the Doctrine of Salvation by Chriſt in its true and proper ſignification a fundamental Article. Cap. 5.

But then more particularly he tells us, *that they muſt not be ſuch truths, as are meerly ſpeculative, and contained only in the underſtanding, but of ſuch only as have a neceſſary influence upon practiſe, and not all thoſe neither, but ſuch as have neceſſary influence upon the Acts and Functions of Chriſtian Life, or whereon the Acts, without which a Chriſtian lives not, depend.*

Such namely, as without the knowledg and belief whereof, we can neither invocate the Father aright, nor have that Faith and relyance upon him, and his Son our Mediator Jeſus Chriſt, which is neceſſary to remiſſion of ſins, and the hope of the Life to come. Where he ſeems evidently to confine Fundamentals to the Doctrine of Salvation by Chriſt, for nothing elſe is neceſſary to what he calls the proper acts and functions of the Chriſtian Life. But he proceeds.

How

Cap. 5. *How far this* ratio *of a Fundamental Article will ſtretch, I know not, but believe it will fetch in moſt of the Articles of the Apoſtles Creed; and by it alſo thoſe two main errors of the* Socinians, *the one denying the divine Nature, the other the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, may be diſcerned to be Fundamental; for without the belief of the firſt, the Divine Majeſty cannot be rightly, that is, incommunicably worſhipp'd, ſo as to have no other Gods beſides him. For he that believes not Chriſt to be conſubſtantial to the Father, and yet honours him with the ſame Worſhip, worſhips not the Father incommunicably, which is the* formalis ratio *of the Worſhip of the true God, from whom we look for eternal Life; and without the belief of the ſecond, the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, there can be, I ſuppoſe, no ſaving Faith nor relyance on Chriſt for the forgiveneſs of ſins.* How well this agrees, with what I have diſcours'd about Fundamentals, every one will eaſily perceive.

Some other learned men go the ſame way with Mr. *Mede*, in aſſigning the general *Ratio* or Notion of Fundamentals, that they are ſuch Doctrines, as have a great influence upon a Chriſtian Life, though they do not confine it, as he

he does, to ſome peculiar acts of the Chriſtian Life, and he could have no reaſon to do ſo, had he not ſome other Notion of Fundamentals in his mind, than what he expreſſed, for all the acts of Piety and Vertue are equally required of us by the Laws of the Goſpel, and therefore it is moſt reaſonable in this way, to extend the Notion of Fundamentals to all thoſe Doctrines, which have an univerſal influence upon a good Life; but I have ſomething to offer with all modeſty, and juſt reſpect and deference to ſuch great names againſt this Notion of Fundamentals. Cap. 5.

1. That a holy Life is not the only deſign of the Chriſtian Religion, and therefore if we will judge of fundamental Doctrines by the end, they are intended to ſerve, we muſt take in the whole and entire end of the Chriſtian Religion, which is forgiveneſs of ſins, as well as holyneſs of Life: And therefore whatever is neceſſary to be believed for the forgiveneſs of ſins is a fundamental Doctrine of Chriſtianity, though we could not ſee, what direct and immediate influence it has upon the reformation of our Lives. 90, 280

Cap. 5. 2. The Doctrine of the ever bleſſed Trinity, hath in all ages of the Church been accounted a fundamental Article, and yet nothing is more plain, than that the belief of three divine Perſons, conſidered only as three Perſons, has no greater force in it to make men good, than the belief of one ſupreme and eternal God. It is true, when we conſider all theſe divine Perſons as concerned in the Oeconomy of Man's Salvation; ſo the belief of each Perſon has a diſtinct and powerful influence upon our minds, but this is not owing immediately to the Doctrine of the Trinity, but to the Doctrine of man's Salvation by Chriſt, who was ſent into the World by his Father, to accompliſh the Work of our redemption, and when he left the World, ſent his holy Spirit to abide with us.

278

3. All thoſe Doctrines, which have a powerful influence upon a good life, are not in a ſtrict and proper ſence Chriſtian Doctrines, much leſs fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, and therefore this can be no good Criterion of a Fundamental; ſuch are all the natural arguments to Religion and a vertuous Life, which though they be adopted

ted into Chriſtianity, yet will hardly pass for fundamentals of Chriſtianity with any man, who can diſtinguiſh between natural knowledg and Revelation. Cap. 5.

4. Men may live very holy lives without the knowledg or belief of many Doctrines, which are excellently fitted to promote holineſs, and therefore every Doctrine, which will advance holineſs, is not Fundamental, and yet this general rule does not direct us, how to diſtinguiſh them.

5. Nay, many Doctrines, which are ſo far from being Fundamental, that they are falſe, may yet prevail with and incline ſome men to the practiſe of real holineſs.

6. Some Doctrines, which naturally tend to debauch mens lives, are not yet fundamental Errors, for men may believe them and yet live well; and therefore we ſhall ſtill want a Rule to judg of fundamental Hereſies by, unleſs no Hereſie be Fundamental, but when it debauches mens lives, and by the ſame rule, no Doctrine is Fundamental, but when it actually governs and reforms our lives.

Cap. 5. 7. This leaves men at great liberty to believe what Doctrines they pleaſe to be Fundamental, and to change even Chriſtianity it ſelf into a new Religion; for if they think they can obey God without ſuch Doctrines, nay without the belief of Chriſtianity it ſelf, I cannot ſee, why they ſhould believe Chriſtianity it ſelf to be a fundamental Doctrine to them.

8. I readily grant, that no Doctrine can be a fundamental Article of Faith, which has not one way or other an influence upon a Chriſtian life. But then all the peculiar Arguments of the Goſpel, all the principles of pure evangelical Obedience, as well as all the Fundamentals of Faith, are contained in the Doctrine of Salvation by Chriſt. That it ſelf is the great motive of the Goſpel, and every part and branch of it is big with arguments and perſwaſives to Vertue. Take away the Doctrine of Salvation, and no other conſideration can have any force; and there needs no other Arguments to a Chriſtian, nay, there are no other Goſpel-Motives, but what are contained in it. Whatever is eſſential to the Doctrine of Salvation, is a Fundamental Ar-

Article and a powerful Motive of Chriſtianity, and nothing elſe is either. So that there is no ſuch certain way to diſcern Fundamentals, though they were to be tryed by their tendency to promote real Righteouſneſs, as to conſider, what is eſſential to the Doctrine of Salvation by Chriſt, which is an acknowledged Fundamental, and contains in it all the principles of a Chriſtian Life. Cap. 5.

2. I deſire, it may be further obſerved, that when I diſcourſe of Fundamentals, I do not reject all other Doctrines beſides what are ſtrictly Fundamental, as uſeleſs in the Chriſtian Life, or unfit terms of Church Communion. God affords us more than what is barely neceſſary, for our ſpiritual, as well as for our natural life; and expects from us, that we ſhould make daily improvements in Knowledg and Vertue: And if this be the duty of private Chriſtians, it is much more the duty of particular Churches to arrive at the greateſt perfection of Knowledg, and to inſtruct her Children, not only in thoſe Doctrines, which are abſolutely neceſſary to the being of Chriſtianity, but in all thoſe great truths, which advance our Pro-

Cap. 5.

The Authority of a Ch. to require Terms of Communion.

greſs in the Chriſtian Life. And therefore no doubt, but every Church has Authority over her own Members, to require, as the terms of Communion, an explicite aſſent to many great and uſeful truths, and an abrenunciation of many dangerous Errors, which are not in a ſtrict ſence Fundamental; or elſe ſhe has no Authority to teach the whole mind and will of God, nor to preſerve the purity of Chriſtian Doctrine: For there are many Doctrines of vaſt uſe in the Chriſtian Life, and many very fatal and pernicious Errors, which are not properly Fundamental, and yet it may be, have occaſioned the final Damnation of many more, than ever fundamental Errors have done. And if the Church be bound to take care of mens Souls, ſhe is bound alſo to root out ſuch pernicious Doctrines. But the uſe I deſigned the Doctrine of Fundamentals for in this place, is the preſervation of Catholick Communion between diſtinct Churches, which have no Power and Authority over each other: For though a Church have entertained many corrupt and dangerous Doctrines, yet if ſhe profeſs to believe all the Fundamentals of Chriſtian Faith, we have no

no Authority upon the account of Doctrines to divide from her Communion: We must not indeed communicate in her Errors, though not Fundamental, and no Church, but the Church of *Rome* impoſes ſuch hard terms of Communion upon other Churches, but while ſhe retains all the eſſentials of Chriſtian Faith, ſhe is ſo far a true Church; and if there be nothing to hinder it, may and ought to be received into Catholick Communion. Cap. 5. 316

3. When I aſſert, that ſuch and ſuch Doctrines are Fundamental, by Fundamentals I underſtand the Fundamentals of Chriſtian Knowledg, without which, no man can underſtand and believe like a Chriſtian, which plainly proves, that they are neceſſary to the very being of a Chriſtian Church, and therefore neceſſary to Catholick Communion: Which is all I am concerned to prove.

But if any man ſhould put hard Caſes to me with reſpect to the final Salvation of particular Chriſtians, and inquire how far the explicite knowledg and belief of Fundamentals is neceſſary to Salvation: What ſhall become of ſo many Chriſtians as are guilty of groſs ignorance for want of good Inſtruction,

Cap. 5. and ſcarce underſtand any thing diſtinctly of the Chriſtian Religion? or
253, 272 what ſhall become of thoſe, who through the prejudices and prepoſſeſſions of Education, deny any fundamental Article of the Chriſtian Faith, as the Divinity of Chriſt, or his ſatisfaction for ſins, and yet are otherwiſe very pious, devout, and uſeful men? I ſay, I do not think my ſelf bound to anſwer theſe Queſtions, nor to ſearch into the ſecret Counſels of God, to determine how he will judge the World, or what allowances he will make in ſome favourable Caſes; but yet I have ſome few things to offer, which poſſibly may give ſome ſatisfaction to modeſt Inquirers.

1. We muſt not deny the neceſſity of Chriſtian Faith and Knowledg for the ſake of any difficult Caſes; for that is to deny the neceſſity of Chriſtianity it ſelf, or of Faith in Chriſt, to the Salvation of ſinners; and thus our Charity to other men will make us our ſelves the greateſt Hereticks of all. And if any part of Chriſtian Faith and Knowledg is neceſſary to Salvation, certainly the knowledg and belief of Fundamentals is, which are therefore commonly deſcribed by this Character, *the knowledg*

and

and belief of which is neceſſary to Salvation: And if Infidelity be a damning ſin, why ſhould not a fundamental Hereſie be ſo, which is infidelity with reſpect to ſome eſſential and ſaving Doctrine of Chriſtianity, and in its conſequence overthrows ſome material and eſſential part of the Chriſtian Faith. Cap. 5.

2. There is a vaſt difference between the Caſe of thoſe men, who for want of good Inſtruction, have not an explicite underſtanding of the Fundamentals of Chriſtian Faith, and of thoſe, who deny any Fundamental. As for the firſt, a very little indiſtinct knowledg of Chriſt, if it govern their lives, and teach them to live in Obedience to their Saviour, will carry them ſafely to Heaven, for God requires little of thoſe to whom little is given. Now there is no man, that deſerves the name of a Chriſtian, who has not learnt his Creed, who does not know and believe, that Jeſus Chriſt came into the World to die for ſin, and to ſave ſinners, and that God for Chriſt's ſake will forgive our ſins, if we repent of them, and live a new life; now ſuch a general knowledg as this, without any fundamental Error to ſpoil the vertue and efficacy of it, may

ſuffice

Cap. 5. ſuffice to produce all thoſe Acts of a Chriſtian life, which are abſolutely neceſſary to a ſtate of Salvation, ſuch as Repentance from dead works, and a truſt and affiance in God through the Blood of Chriſt for forgiveneſs of ſins. The Thief upon the Croſs cannot well be ſuppoſed to have known ſo much, and the Jewiſh Converts, who embraced the Faith upon St. *Peters* preaching to them, and were immediately baptized in great numbers, cannot be ſuppoſed at that time to know more; and yet this was accepted from them at that time, and in that ſtate of things, and by the ſame reaſon will be accepted from thoſe, who want the opportunities of better inſtruction: And if there be any baptized and nominal Chriſtians, who do not know thus much, it is a great ſcandal to the Chriſtian Church, but I know not, how we are more concerned for their Salvation, than for Pagans and Infidels.

But as for thoſe, who deny any fundamental Article, they are got above this ſtate of a general and implicite Faith in Chriſt, and err not for want of inſtruction, but from a certain wantonneſs and pride of underſtanding.

They

They inquire into the particular Doctrines of Faith, and underſtand, what has been, and is, the general Faith of Chriſtians in ſuch matters, for otherwiſe they would have no occaſion to deny ſuch Catholick Doctrines; it appears, they have a great conceit and confidence of their own knowledg, that they dare oppoſe their private opinions and reaſonings againſt the declared ſence of the univerſal Church, which is ſuch unpardonable immodeſty, as admits of no excuſe, if they loſe themſelves in the Mazes and Labyrinths of their own making, and miſtake their way to Heaven. And though ſuch Perſons may be otherwiſe very pious and uſeful men, yet I do not ſee, why we ſhould deny the neceſſity of believing the Fundamentals of Chriſtian Faith any more for their ſakes, than for the ſake of devout and vertuous Jews and Heathens. Cap. 5.

2. Having thus, as plainly as I can, ſtated the notion of Fundamentals, the next inquiry is concerning thoſe Churches, which profeſſedly own all the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity, and yet together with the belief of all Fundamentals entertain ſuch corrupt Doctrines,

as

Cap. 5. as in their immediate and neceſſary conſequences overthrow Foundations, and whether ſuch Churches may be ſaid to err Fundamentally.

I will but briefly touch on this head, and though I might give too many inſtances of it, I ſhall at preſent confine my ſelf to the Church of *Rome*. I know no fundamental Article of our Faith, that is expreſly denyed by the Church of *Rome*. She receives all the ancient Creeds, profeſſes the Faith of the holy Trinity, the Incarnation, the ſatisfaction of Chriſt's death, his Intercеſſion for us at the right hand of God, but then ſhe teaches ſuch other corrupt Doctrines, as all the wit of man cannot reconcile with this Faith: As to ſhew this briefly with reference to the ſatisfaction, and interceſſion of Chriſt.

The Ch. of Rome owns all ye Fundamental Artt. of Xty, but teachs Doctrines subversive of many of 'em.

311

The Doctrine of Chriſt's ſatisfaction ſeems many ways to be overthrown by the Church of *Rome*: As by the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Maſs, which is offered for the quick and for the dead; For if Chriſt made a perfect ſatisfaction for ſin by his death upon the Croſs, what need of repeating this Sacrifice every day, which repreſents the Sacrifice of Chriſt, to be as imperfect as the Sa-

Sacrifices of the Law, which could not take away ſin, nor make the comers thereunto perfect, and therefore were repeated again every year. Thus the Doctrine of humane Penances and Satisfactions, eſpecially the fire of Purgatory, the merits of good Works, and the ſuperabundant merits of ſome eminent Saints, which compoſe the Treaſury of the Church, and may be applyed by the Pope to other ſinners to purchaſe their Pardon, which is the Foundation of the Doctrine of indulgences, ſeem mightily to diſparage the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, for if he have made a perfect atonement for all our ſins, we need not invent ſo many other ways of ſatisfaction. Cap. 5.

And whoever conſiders what the Church of *Rome* teaches about the Interceſſion of Saints and Angels and the Virgin *Mary*, could hardly think that ſhe did believe, that there is but one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Chriſt Jeſus.

But I need not enumerate many particulars, the truth of this being too evident and notorious: The great Queſtion then is this, whether ſuch a Church may be ſaid to be guilty of Fundamental

Cap. 5. tal Errors; for this ſounds like a contradiction, that a Church which believes all the fundamental Articles of that Chriſtian Faith, ſhould yet be guilty of fundamental Errors. And indeed if by fundamental Errors, we mean ſuch Errors as deny any fundamental Article, ſo it is plain, that a Church which owns and profeſſes all Fundamentals, cannot be guilty of fundamental Errors, but if by fundamental Errors, we mean ſuch Errors, as contradict the Fundamentals of Faith, ſo ſhe may be guilty of fundamental Errors, becauſe it is poſſible for a Church to believe two Doctrines, which contradict each other, when the Contradiction is not in expreſs terms, but conſequential: For all men or Churches do not ſee, or will not own the immediate and neceſſary conſequences of their own Doctrine; as may eaſily be obſerved among a great many other men beſides thoſe of the Church of *Rome*. And the uſe of this obſervation is very conſiderable upon many accounts, but eſpecially in our preſent Diſpute about Catholick Communion, as will appear by conſidering.

3. How

3. How far and in what Caſes we may communicate with ſuch a Church, as believes all the Fundamentals of Chriſtian Faith, and yet teaches ſuch Doctrines, as in their immediate and neceſſary conſequences overthrow Foundations. This is a very material difference between a Church, which denies any fundamental Article of Faith, and a Church, which believes all Fundamentals, but ſuperadds ſome corrupt Doctrines, which in their Conſequences deſtroy Foundations; that the firſt is never capable of Catholick Communion, becauſe ſhe denies Catholick Doctrine, which is the neceſſary condition of Catholick Communion; but the ſecond in ſome caſes may be, becauſe ſhe retains all ſaving knowledg, *i. e.* all which is of abſolute neceſſity to Salvation, though intermixt with dangerous Errors. Now to ſtate this matter, how far we may communicate with ſuch a Church as profeſſes all the fundamental Articles of Faith, but yet ſuperadds other very corrupt and dangerous Doctrines, we may conſider theſe two things. Cap. 5.

1. I

Cap. 5. 1. I think, I need not tell any man that we muſt not purchaſe the Communion of ſuch a Church, by profeſſing our Aſſent to any corrupt Doctrine, though it be not a fundamental Error. No one Church ought thus to impoſe upon another, nor does any Church pretend to it, but only the Church of *Rome*. Every Church is bound to preſerve her own Faith, as pure and perfect, as ſhe can; but ſhe has not that Authority over any other Church, as to impoſe upon their Faith. An orthodox Church may and ought to admoniſh neighbour Churches of any doctrinal Corruptions, but muſt not reject their Communion for every Error, though of dangerous Conſequence, if it be not Fundamental. The belief of all fundamental Articles of Faith, does mightily qualifie the evil and malignant influence of many very corrupt Doctrines; which is the true reaſon, why many men are obſerved to live much better than they believe, becauſe, though they have entertained a great many corrupt Doctrines, which in their natural Conſequences are very apt to tempt men to ſin, and to encourage them in it; yet, when withal they heartily believe

lieve all the fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Faith, this true Faith is so directly contrary to the ill consequences of their Errors, that they do not see the ill consequences of such Doctrines, or are sufficiently antidoted against the poyson of them; nay many times it so happens, that men are so far from seeing the ill Consequences of their Doctrines, that they draw only good Consequences from them, which may make them as good or better men, than many are, who have a better Faith. Cap. 5.

Thus to instance at present in some very popular and prevailing Doctrines, not disputing whether they be true or false. The Doctrine of absolute Election and Reprobation, the Inconditionality of the Covenant of Grace, the no-necessity of holiness to our justification, the absolute impotency of humane nature to do the least good, the irresistibility of the divine Grace, and such like Antinomian Doctrines, are charged by their Adversaries with as dismal consequences, as any Doctrines are capable of, even to the overthrow of all Religion; and I doubt not but have very ill effects upon mens minds, who are not throughly possest with some other

Cap. 5. Principles to qualifie and allay them. But yet if after all this, theſe men do firmly believe the infinite goodneſs and juſtice of God, the inflexible holineſs and purity of his nature, his irreconcileable enmity to all ſin, and that they ſhall never go to Heaven without holineſs, it is impoſſible, they ſhould make any ill uſe of theſe Doctrines to encourage themſelves in ſin; and on the other hand, if they believe, right or wrong, that theſe Doctrines do mightily advance the grace of God in the Salvation of ſinners, it may increaſe their love to God, inflame their Devotions; and make them very active in all holy obedience. For when men are poſſeſt with a prevailing ſence of the grace and love of God and our Saviour, they may ſpare a great many other arguments to obedience.

Now we muſt not hence infer, that it is indifferent, whether men believe right or wrong, for every practical Error is a ſtate of Temptation, and erroneous Doctrines do oftner hinder the efficacy of an orthodox Faith, than an orthodox Faith prevents the miſchief of an erroneous perſwaſion, as is lamentably ſeen in the lives of too many men:

But

But the only inference I draw from hence is this, that every Error, though in it ſelf of dangerous conſequence, is not a ſufficient reaſon to deny Communion to ſuch a Church, as notwithſtanding ſuch Errors, profeſſes all the fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, if we can maintain Communion with her without profeſſing her Errors. Cap. 5.

2. While the fundamental Doctrines of Faith are ſecure, no corrupt Doctrines are a ſufficient reaſon to break Communion, which do not corrupt the Chriſtian Worſhip. The principal Acts of Chriſtian Communion conſiſt in Chriſtian Worſhip; and if any Church have ſo corrupted divine Worſhip, that a good Chriſtian muſt not joyn in it, we muſt of neceſſity abſtain from their Communion, though we are not equally bound to deny them ours. For there are ſome Fundamentals of Worſhip, as well as Faith, as the Worſhip of one God, through one Mediator Jeſus Chriſt, and when any Church corrupts the Worſhip of God in its vital and eſſential parts, as the Church of *Rome* does in the Worſhip of Saints and Angels, and the Virgin *Mary*, and Images,

Cap. 5. and the consecrated Host, it is necessary then to withdraw our selves from such a corrupt Communion.

But then as for those Doctrines, which though they may be corrupt and erroneous, are neither fundamental Errors, nor introduce any such fundamental Corruptions into religious Worship; I can see no imaginable reason, why they should break Communion between neighbour Churches; if no Churches must communicate with each other, which do not exactly agree in all the Disputes and Controversies of Religion, it will be hard to find any two Churches in the World, that can maintain this Christian Communion. Certainly, Catholick Communion requires us to communicate with all those Churches, with whom we can communicate without sin; and therefore when a Church denies no fundamental Article of Faith, nor corrupts the Christian Worship in any fundamental and essential part of it, nor requires us to believe any Doctrine, which we believe to be erroneous, as the necessary terms of Communion with her, that is, when we may communicate with her without doing any thing that is evil, nothing can justifie

ſtifie our breach of Communion. Cap. 5.

As for inſtance, I take the *Lutheran* Doctrine of Conſubſtantiation to be a very great Error, and if they ſhould deny Communion to me, unleſs I would profeſs my belief of it, I ſhould judge it a ſufficient reaſon to withdraw Communion from them; yet if no ſuch Condition be impoſed on me, I would make no ſcruple to communicate with them, becauſe, though Conſubſtantiation be an Error, yet it does not corrupt their Worſhip, as the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation does the Worſhip of the Church of *Rome*. The *Lutheran* Churches obſerve the Inſtitution of our Saviour, without any Idolatrous Worſhip of the Hoſt, their Doctrine makes no change in their Worſhip, and therefore can be no reaſon to withdraw our Communion. The Errors of any Church cannot make its Communion ſinful, unleſs they make its Worſhip ſo. Were Tranſubſtantiation it ſelf (as abſurd a Doctrine, as it is) a meer ſpeculation, without any influence upon Worſhip, did the Church of *Rome* ſtrictly obſerve the Inſtitutions of our Saviour in celebrating the Lord's Supper, without either taking from it, or adding a new

Cap. 5. Idolatrous Worſhip to it, they might enjoy their Opinion, if they pleaſed, ſo they would let me enjoy mine, and I would not break with them meerly upon this ſcore.

Nothing can be vainer, than to dream of reconciling all the Diſputes of Chriſtendom, and of making all men or all Churches of a mind in every thing, and if Catholick Communion cannot be maintained among Churches of a different belief and perſwaſion in ſome controverted points, we muſt never hope for any ſuch thing: And if it may be, our only Inquiry is, what difference and variety of Opinions is conſiſtent with Catholick Communion; and I know no other anſwer to it but this, that we may ſafely communicate with any Church, how different ſoever our Opinions in other matters may be, while we agree in all the Fundamentals of Chriſtian Faith, and Eſſentials of Worſhip.

Thoſe animoſities indeed, which the heats of diſputation occaſion too often, not only between private men, but Chriſtian Churches, ſet them at a much greater diſtance from each other, than the moſt diſtant Opinions; but yet that this

this is practicable, to maintain Chriſtian Communion notwithſtanding this variety of Opinions, is evident, not only from the intrinſick reaſon of the thing, but from manifeſt experience. Cap. 5.

We know how many Sects there were in the Jewiſh Church, eſpecially thoſe two famous Sects of the Phariſees and Sadduces, and yet they lived in the Communion of the ſame Church, offered the ſame Sacrifices, worſhipped God at the ſame Temple, and obſerved the ſame Rites and Ceremonies of Religion; and confined their Diſputes to their ſeveral Schools.

The Jewiſh and the Heathen Converts in the time of the Apoſtles differed about a very material point, the obſervation of the Law of *Moſes*, and yet according to St. *Paul*'s exhortation and command, they lived in the Communion of the ſame Church, and in the joynt exerciſe of all the Acts of Chriſtian Worſhip, as I diſcours'd at large in the Defence. Defence, p. 443. &c.

How many different Opinions are there among the Doctors and Churches of the *Roman* Communion, the *Franciscans*, *Dominicans*, *Jeſuits*? The ſame points are diſputed among them,

Cap. 5. and that with as great warmth and keenneſs, as there are between the *Arminians* and *Calviniſts*, and abundance more. Nay, the *Italian*, and *Spaniſh*, and *French* Churches differ upon thoſe great points of Infallibility, and the Authority and Jurisdiction of the Pope of *Rome*, and yet all live in the Communion of the ſame Church. And I cannot ſee, but that all the Chriſtian Churches in the World, excepting the Church of *Rome*, might maintain Catholick Communion upon as eaſie terms.

The breaches between the *Lutheran* and *Zuinglian* Churches have been often times compoſed, eſpecially between the *Polonian* Churches; an account of which we have at large in *Pareus* his *Irenicum*, which is a plain argument, that it is not meerly the difference of Opinions, but the diſtempers of mens minds, if ſuch agreement and concord be not perpetual; ſo that no doctrinal Diſputes ought to divide the Communion of the Chriſtian Church, but ſuch as ſubvert the foundations of our Faith, or corrupt the eſſentials of Chriſtian Worſhip, and this may ſuffice for the firſt inquiry, what are the terms of Catholick

tholick Communion with respect to Doctrines, from which it evidently appears, that Catholick Communion is neither in its self an impracticable notion, nor the practise of it very difficult to all good Christians. Cap. 5.

II. It is time now to consider the next Inquiry, what are the necessary terms of Catholick Communion, with respect to Church-government. And the only Question I shall endeavour to resolve under this Head, is this. Whether, and in what Cases, it is lawful to communicate with a Church, which is not governed by Bishops, nor by Presbyters, who were ordained by Bishops.

The reason of this Inquiry is plainly this. It is sufficiently known, that there are several Protestant Churches of great note, governed without Bishops, by a Colledge of Presbyters, who have no other Orders, but what they received from Presbyters. Now if Episcopacy be so essential to the Constitution of a Church, that we must not own any Church which has no Bishops, we must renounce the Communion of the Protestant Churches of *France* and *Holland*, and *Geneva*, and some others, which is both

Cap. 5. both a very invidious and uncharitable thing, and a great injury to the Reformed Profeſſion, and does mightily ſtreighten Catholick Communion. If Epiſcopacy be not ſo eſſential to the Conſtitution of a Church, but that we may communicate with thoſe Churches which have no Biſhops, why do we reject our Diſſenters at home, and condemn them of Schiſm, for rejecting the Epiſcopal Authority, and forming themſelves into Church-ſocieties without Biſhops? Why are we not as kind to our own Friends, Neighbours, and Countrey-men, as we are to Foreign Churches?

Now though the Church of *England* has always aſſerted the Authority of Biſhops, and condemned thoſe of her own Communion, who have ſeparated from their Biſhops, yet ſhe has been ſo far from condemning Foreign reformed Churches for the want of Biſhops, that ſhe has always lived in Communion with them, and defended them againſt their accuſers; and I reſolve to ſteer by this Compaſs, ſo to vindicate the Reformed Churches, as neither to injure the Epiſcopal Authority, nor to juſtifie our Schiſms at home. And to do this with

with all poſſible plainneſs, I ſhall proceed by theſe ſteps. Cap. 5.

1. I obſerve, there is a vaſt difference between ſeparating from Epiſcopal Communion, where Epiſcopacy is the ſetled Government of the Church, and living without Epiſcopal Government, where we cannot have it; which makes a great difference between our Diſſenters, and ſome Foreign Churches. Some of the Foreign Proteſtant Churches indeed have no Proteſtant Biſhops, nor ever had, and it may be, could not have; but Epiſcopacy has been the eſtabliſht Government of the Church of *England*, ever ſince the Reformation; and for any Chriſtians to ſeparate from their Biſhops, was always accounted Schiſm by the Chriſtian Church, unleſs there were ſome very neceſſary reaſons to juſtifie ſuch a Separation; but in ſome caſes not to have Biſhops may be no Schiſm.

If any man ſhould object, that the Caſe of our Diſſenters, and the reformed Churches is the very ſame; for the Foreign Churches had Biſhops alſo of the *Roman* Communion, but ſeparated from them, upon account of thoſe intolerable Corruptions, which made their Commu-

Sweden & Denmark retain'd Bps, & several Lutheran Churches retain'd Office tho they have chang'd ye Name vid. inf. in hac pag.

Cap. 5. Communion unlawful, and many of them set up no Bishops of their own; and thus our Dissenters separate from the Church of *England*, and her Bishops, upon account of the corruptions in her Worship, and are as excusable as the *French* Protestant Churches, for setting up a Government without Bishops; I answer. Not to take notice now, what a vast difference there is between separating from the Church of *Rome*, and from the Church of *England*, there is one very obvious difference in this very matter, which takes off the whole objection. For our Dissenters make Dio-
334 cesan Episcopacy to be one reason of their Separation, which no reformed Church ever did before: The Reformed Churches abroad separated from Popish Bishops, our Dissenters separate from Episcopacy it self.

All the reformed Churches abroad owned Episcopacy, though they disowned Popish Bishops; several of them retain both the name and thing, as the Churches of *Sweden*, and *Denmark*: Others retain the Office, though they have changed the name; as several *Lutheran* Churches, which have their superintendents, *Generales* and *Generalissimi*,

ſimi, who anſwer to our Biſhops and Arch-biſhops; and as for thoſe Churches which have them not, they never reject Epiſcopal Communion, but all of them have owned Communion with the Church of *England*, reverenced our Biſhops, highly commended the Conſtitution of our Church, cenſured and condemned our Schiſmaticks, and declared their judgments in favour of Epiſcopacy, and wiſhed the reſtitution of it, and the moſt ſome of their moſt learned men have pretended to, was only to juſtifie the Lawfulneſs of a Preſbyterian parity. It were eaſie here to fill up ſeveral Pages with the judgment of the moſt famous Divines abroad, but this has been ſo often done by others, and very lately by Dr. *Saywell*, that I ſhall refer my Readers to them for ſatisfaction in this point. And is not this a very material difference between our Diſſenters, and the reformed Churches abroad, which have not Epiſcopal Government? Our Diſſenters ſeparate from Epiſcopacy, which they own; from our reformed Biſhops, which they maintain Communion with, and therefore are as well Separatiſts from the reformed Presbyterian Churches, as from the Church of *England*. 2. As

Cap. 5.

Durel's Church-government. *Saywell's* Evangelical and Catholick Unity, *&c.* p. 228, *&c.*

Cap. 5. 2. As it is Schiſm without abſolute neceſſity to caſt off the Authority of our Biſhops, and to ſeparate from them, ſo it is much more ſo to reject Epiſcopal Communion and the Government
332 of Biſhops, as unlawful and Antichriſtian; which makes a very material difference between our Diſſenters, and thoſe reformed Churches abroad, who have no Biſhops of their own.

There is nothing our Diſſenters more vehemently oppoſe than Epiſcopal Government, for which, they never think, they can find names bad enough: Not to mention others at preſent, this is the great deſign of Mr. *Baxter's* late Hiſtory of Epiſcopacy, to prove, that Dioceſan Epiſcopacy in the very Nature and Conſtitution of it, overthrows the Government of Chriſt's Inſtitution: This is his great deſign in his Abridgement of Church-Hiſtory, to beſpatter and vilifie the moſt renowned Biſhops of the Church, to reproach all their Actions, to charge them with all the Hereſies and Schiſms, which have diſturbed the Church, and to paint them in ſuch frightful ſhapes, that all Chriſtians may flie from them as the great troublers of our *Iſrael*: I cannot imagine, what ſervice

vice he could think to do by this to common Chriſtianity, which is concerned in nothing more, than in the Credit and Reputation of the chief Miniſters of Religion, but I muſt acknowledge, all this was admirably calculated to ſerve a Faction. Cap. 5.

But the Foreign Churches, which have no Biſhops, do not condemn Epiſcopacy, nor ſeparate from it, as an unlawful Communion, and whoever does ſo, is a Schiſmatick from the Catholick Church. This is ſo plain, that there needs no proof of it. For let men talk never ſo ill of Biſhops, and their Government, the matter of fact is evident, that the Church of Chriſt has for many hundred years had no other Government, than that of Biſhops. They can ſhew no Church till the Reformation, which was governed without Biſhops; even ſuch Dioceſan Biſhops, as our Diſſenters now vent their Spleen againſt. Dr. *Owen* indeed and Mr. *Baxter* would gladly except the two firſt Centuries, but what little reaſon they have for it, has been already examined in the Defence; but however, they are all forc'd to acknowledg, that in the ſucceeding Ages of the Church

No Church before the Reformation governed w^t^out Bps.

Def. p. 344.

Cap. 5. Church till the Reformation, which was above twelve hundred years, the Church was governed by Dioceſan Biſhops, as it is at this day; ſo that by renouncing the Epiſcopal Communion of the Church in our Age, they ſeparate from the whole Catholick Church for ſo many hundred years. As far as Epiſcopal Government is concerned, they condemn the whole Catholick Church in their ſeparation from the Church of *England*, as governed by Dioceſan Biſhops; nay herein they ſeparate alſo from all the reformed Churches, who hold Communion with the Epiſcopal Church of *England*; and if this be not enough to prove them Schiſmaticks, there is no ſuch thing as Schiſm from the Church; for there was no Church for near fifteen hundred years, nor is there at this day, which they can communicate with upon theſe Principles, but their own beloved Conventicles; for it has always been accounted as unlawful, to communicate with ſuch a Church, as communicates with another Church, whoſe Communion is ſinful, as it is to communicate with ſuch a Church our ſelves, and it muſt be ſo according to the Principles

inf. 384, 5.

of

of Catholick Communion. And therefore if it be unlawful to communicate with the Church of *England*, as governed by Biſhops, it muſt be unlawful alſo to communicate with thoſe Proteſtant Presbyterian Churches, which communicate with the Church of *England*. Cap. 5.

This, I ſuppoſe, may ſatisfie any man, what little reaſon our Diſſenters have to talk ſo much of Foreign reformed Churches, for their caſe is very different; that which will juſtifie thoſe Foreign Churches which have no Biſhops, will not juſtifie our Diſſenters, who have Biſhops, but ſeparate from them. For though they have no Biſhops, they do not ſeparate from Epiſcopal Churches, nor condemn Epiſcopacy, as an unlawful or Antichriſtian Government, but hold Communion with the Church of *England*, which our Diſſenters have rent and divided by Schiſmatical ſeparations.

3. Let us then conſider, what may be ſaid in juſtification of thoſe reformed Churches, which have no Biſhops, whether their want of Biſhops does unchurch them, and make it unlawful for us to hold Communion with them. This

Cap. 5. is a very nice and tender point; for to condemn all the reformed Churches, which have no Biſhops, ſeems ſo hard and uncharitable, that the Church of *England* has always declined it; but then abſolutely to juſtifie them, overthrows the ancient government by Biſhops, and is made uſe of by our Diſſenters to pull down Epiſcopacy, if the preſent Biſhops do not pleaſe them; which is impoſſible for any Biſhop to do, who will be true to his own Authority, and to the conſtitutions of our Church.

461

And therefore in ſtating this matter, I muſt go a middle way, neither abſolutely to condemn, nor abſolutely to juſtifie them; For, 1. As believing the divine right of Epiſcopal Government, which I ſhall not now go about to prove, I muſt acknowledg thoſe Churches, which have no Biſhops, to be very imperfect and defective, and that they are bound, as far as they can, to endeavour to reſtore the Epiſcopal Authority; and if they fail in this, ſo far as they are chargeable with this neglect, what in ſome caſes is a pardonable defect, may become, eſpecially in the Governors of ſuch a Church, a very great Crime.

Crime. For no Church muſt wantonly change a divine Inſtitution; we condemn the Church of *Rome* for taking away the Cup from the Laity, and I think every divine Inſtitution has ſomething ſo ſacred in it, as not to be lightly rejected or altered without abſolute neceſſity. Cap. 5.

2. But yet the caſe may be ſuch, that the want of Epiſcopal Government may not un-church ſuch a ſociety of Chriſtians, nor make it unlawful for other Chriſtians to maintain Communion with them. As will appear from theſe following conſiderations.

1. That the change of ſome poſitive Inſtitutions does not preſently un-church thoſe, who are guilty of it.

2. Eſpecially if there be an abſolute or very great neceſſity for doing it.

3. Eſpecially if the caſe be ſuch, that at leaſt they have a preſumptive allowance from the Catholick Church to do it.

1. That the change of ſome poſitive Inſtitutions does not preſently un-church thoſe, who are guilty of it. I need not ſpend many words to prove this, for when the caſe is propoſed in general, I think no man will deny it. The obſer-

Cap. 5. ſervation of all divine Inſtitutions is neceſſary to the perfection of a Church, but it is not ſo to the being of it: That is, though God does ſtrictly require the obſervance of all his Statutes, yet every poſitive command is not of that moment, that God will diſanul his Covenant with ſuch a People for the neglect or change of it.

If ever God would have done this, we might moſt reaſonably expect it under the Jewiſh Oeconomy, in which every minute Circumſtance was ſo ſtrictly commanded by God, as having ſomething Sacred and Typical in it, and yet it does not appear, that every deviation from their Rule, though in ſome very material parts of it, did provoke God to caſt them off.

God had appointed a certain place, where they ſhould offer their Sacrifices to him, and when this place was actually fixed and determined, it was unlawful for them to offer Sacrifice in any other place. And yet when the Temple at *Jeruſalem* was built, which was the only place God had appointed for Sacrifice, the People continued to offer Sacrifice in their high places, even in the Reign of very good Kings, and though

though this practiſe was condemned, yet it did not un-church them. Cap. 5.

God had appointed *Aarons* Family for the Prieſthood, and yet *Jeroboam* made Prieſts of other Tribes and Families, and the Law, which expreſly appoints *Aaron* and his Sons for the Prieſts Office, only threatens death againſt Uſurpers: *Thou ſhalt appoint* Aaron *and his Sons, and they ſhall wait on the Prieſts Office, and the ſtranger that cometh nigh ſhall be put to death.* God did not reject the Church of *Iſrael* for the irregularities of their Prieſts, but owned them for his Church and People many years after this, till they defiled themſelves with the worſhip of *Baal*, and other Heathen Gods. And *Joſephus* obſerves, that after the death of *Menelaus*, *Antiochus* made *Alchymus* High-Prieſt, who was not of the Family of the Prieſts; and yet I ſhould be loth to ſay, that ſuch an irregular promotion did un-church the Jewiſh Church; and whoever conſiders in what manner the High-Prieſts were advanced and depoſed even in the time of our Saviour, poſſibly may think it, as inconſiſtent with the firſt Inſtitution of that Office, as the irregular Ordinations of Presbyters.

1 Kings 12. 31.

Numb. 3. 10.

Joſeph. Antiq. l. 12. cap. 14.

Cap. 5.

2. We ought especially to consider the force and power of necessity to dispence even with divine Institutions: No necessity can dispence with the eternal Laws of good and evil, because no necessity can be pleaded to justifie men in sin, though in some cases it may extenuate the evil and guilt of it, for the internal necessity in the nature of things is stronger than any external necessity can be; no external force can compel men to sin, which is an Act of their own will and choice, and the obligations to Vertue remain in the most extreme necessity. But in positive Institutions, which depend upon the Will of God, we find necessity has often dispensed, and that with God's allowance and approbation. As to give some few examples of it.

Necessity dispenses with Pos. Institut.

1. The necessity of the divine Worship has dispensed with positive Institutions. Thus in *Hezekiah's* Sacrifice, the Priests being too few, the Levites assisted them in doing the Priests work, in slaying the Sacrifices; and the like we may see in *Josiah's* Passeover. And by the same reason we may suppose, that if the Family of *Aaron* had failed, other Families of the Tribe of *Levi* might have

2 Chron. 29. 34. 35. 11.

have ſucceeded into the Prieſt's Office, Cap. 5.
though againſt a poſitive Law: For the neceſſity of the divine Worſhip is much greater and more unalterable, than the confinement of the Prieſthood to a certain Family, and where the divine Providence makes a neceſſity, neceſſity will make a Prieſt.

Where Providence makes a Neceſſity, Neceſſity will make a Prieſt.

And therefore I think, a late learned and ingenious Author, who diſputes ſo earneſtly, that the Power of adminiſtring Sacraments muſt be derived from God, and that this Power now is given only by Epiſcopal Ordination, ought to have diſtinguiſhed between the ordinary and extraordinary conveyance of Power. Whoever adminiſters in holy things, muſt derive his Power from God, becauſe he acts in God's Name, and when it may be done, he muſt derive his Power in ſuch a way, as God hath appointed by a poſitive Law, and whoever rejects this way without neceſſity, can have no valid Power, but whatever he does, is null and void; as I doubt not, but all Ordinations of Presbyters are in oppoſition to, and contempt of their Biſhops, as I think, that learned man hath ſufficiently proved: But the caſe of neceſſity ought to be conſider-

mr Dodwell.

Cap. 5. ed, it being contrary to the Nature of all positive Institutions to oblige in case of necessity; and I take that to be a case of necessity, when Episcopal Orders cannot be had, and yet the Church must fail without them. Bishops are for the Church, not the Church for Bishops; and when the ordinary conveyance of this Authority fails, necessity legitimates other extraordinary ways. We have all the reason in the World to presume in such cases, that God will confirm and ratifie the choice and designation of the People, much more the Ordinations of the Presbytery, where Episcopal Ordination cannot be had. For I see no reason, why Presbyters may not do the Bishops work in case of necessity, as well as Levites do the work of Priests. *Supr.* 342.

Necessity dispenses with positive Laws.

2. The necessity of mens lives dispense with positive Laws. Upon this account our Saviour justifies *David*'s eating the Shew-Bread, when he was an hungred, which was not lawful for him to eat, but for the Priests; and his Disciples plucking the Ears of Corn on the Sabbath day: Upon this Principle, *Matathias* allowed the Jews to fight on the Sabbath-day, in case they were assaulted by

Mark 2. 24, 25, 26.

Joseph. antiq. l. 12. cap. 7.

by their Enemies; and our Saviour re- Cap. 5.
ſolves all ſuch caſes by that general Principle, *I will have mercy and not Sacrifice*; and certainly, mercy to the Souls of men is as conſiderable as any temporal concernments.

3. But we may further conſider, what force and Authority the preſumptive allowance of the Church has in ſuch caſes. The Chriſtian Church in all Ages has thought fit to diſpenſe with poſitive Inſtitutions in caſe of neceſſity, and by her own Approbation and Authority to ſupply the defects and irregularities of ſuch Adminiſtrations, and therefore certainly did believe ſhe had Power to do it: And indeed if there be not ſufficient Authority in the Church to provide for caſes of neceſſity, the Power of the Church is more defective than of any other Society of men, and cannot in many caſes without a miracle preſerve her own being; and therefore if the Church may be preſumed in caſes of neceſſity to allow Perſons to perform ſuch religious Offices and Miniſtries, as otherwiſe they are not qualified to perform; this very allowance ſupplies the incapacity of the Perſon, and does virtually confer that Authority on him, which

Cap. 5. which in other cases he had not.

Now it is not only highly reasonable to presume, that the Catholick Church will rather allow the Ordinations of Presbyters, though they are not regularly qualified for that Office, where there are no Bishops to Ordain, than that a considerable member of the Christian Church should want a succession of Pastors to instruct and govern them, and administer all religious Offices to them; but besides the reason of the thing, the practise of the Church is a sufficient ground for this presumption.

The Validity of Lay-Baptism

For we know the use of Orders is to confer Authority and Power to administer the Sacraments, and yet the Church has allowed even Lay-men to baptize, and if we will believe *Tertullian* to consecrate too, in case of necessity, that is, where there have been no Bishops, nor Presbyters to administer those Offices, and we may as well presume the allowance of the Church for Presbyters to Ordain, when there are no Bishops, as for Lay-men to administer the Sacraments, where there are no Bishops nor Presbyters.

Ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, & offers, & tinguis, & sacerdos es tibi solus. Tert. de exhort. cast. cap. 7.

Vid. Dean's Examin. of the Right of Kings Ch. p. 261.

I

I alledge *Tertullian*'s Authority, not for the ſake of his reaſon, but as a witneſs of primitive Practiſe : The reaſonings of particular men do not always expreſs the ſence of the Church, but their own private Opinions, though they may be allowed to be good Witneſſes, what the practiſe of the Church was in their days : Though I confeſs, I cannot ſee, that any thing *Tertullian* ſays, does derogate from the Evangelical Prieſthood, or deſtroy the diſtinction between the Clergy and Laity, or encourage private Chriſtians to invade the Miniſterial Function. He ſays indeed, that even Lay-men are Prieſts, Chriſt having made us all Kings and Prieſts to God his Father; by which he means, that every Chriſtian through our great Advocate and Mediator, has now ſo near and free acceſs to God, and ſuch aſſurance of acceptance, as was thought peculiar to Prieſts in former Ages. Well but is there no diſtinction then betwixt the Chriſtian Clergy and People? Yes, this he owns, but ſays it is by the appointment and conſtitution

Cap. 5.

Nonne & laici ſacerdotes ſumus? ſcriptum eſt, regnum quoq; nos & ſacerdotes Deo & patri ſuo fecit. Ibid.

104

Rev. 1. 6.

Bennet's Rights of ye Clergy of ye Xch. 252, &c

Differentiam inter ordinem & plebem conſtituit eccleſiæ Auctoritas, & honor per ordinis confeſſum ſanctificatus.

Cap. 5. ſtitution of the Church. What does he mean by this? That it is a humane, arbitrary, and alterable Conſtitution? By no means! But it is the honour of a peculiar Sanctification and Separation of certain Perſons to the work of the Miniſtry, to which God has annexed his Bleſſing and Authority. And therefore the Conſtitution of the Church here includes the Authority of Chriſt, and of his Apoſtles, who from the beginning have made this diſtinction, as *Tertullian* every where confeſſes.

Si habes jus ſacerdotis in temetipſo, ubi neceſſe eſt, habeas oportet etiam diſciplinam ſacerdotii, ubi neceſſe ſit habere jus ſacerdotii. Ib.

To what purpoſe then is all this? How does he hence prove, that every man in caſe of neceſſity is a Prieſt to himſelf? That he has the right of Prieſthood in himſelf, when it is neceſſary, and therefore may perform the Office of a Prieſt alſo, when it is neceſſary? For if Chriſt and his Apoſtles have from the firſt Foundations of the Chriſtian Church made a diſtinction between the Evangelical Prieſthood and the People, and have inſtituted the Miniſterial Office with a peculiar Power and Authority, how can it be lawful for a private Chriſtian upon a pretence of the general Prieſthood of

of Chriſtians, in any caſe whatſoever, to perform ſuch religious Acts, as are peculiar to the Evangelical Miniſtry? Cap. 5.

But the force of *Tertullian*'s reaſon ſeems to conſiſt in this; That all Chriſtians being an Evangelical Prieſthood, to offer up the ſpiritual Sacrifices of Prayers and Thankſgivings to God, through the merits and mediation of our great High-Prieſt, they are not debarr'd by any perſonal incapacity, nor by the typical and myſterious Nature of the Chriſtian Inſtitutions, from performing any religious Office, which Chriſt has commanded his Church; but yet for the better ſecurity of publick Inſtructions, for the more regular Adminiſtration of religious Offices, for the preſervation of Unity, Order, Diſcipline, and Government in the Church, Chriſt hath committed the power of Government and Diſcipline, and publick Adminiſtration of religious Offices, to Perſons peculiarly devoted and ſet apart for the work of the Miniſtry. But the Inſtitution of this Order being wholly for the ſervice of the Church, and not for any other myſtical reaſons, in caſe of failure, where there are none of this holy Order to perform religious Offices,

the

Cap. 5. the universal Priesthood of Christians takes place, and any private Christian without a regular and external Consecration to this Function, may perform all the Duties and Offices of a Priest.

A remarkable Difference twixt Aaronical & Evangelical Priesthood

For there are two things, wherein the Aaronical and Evangelical Priesthood differ, which make a mighty alteration in this case. The Aaronical Priesthood was Typical or Mystical, and Mediatory, the Evangelical Priesthood is neither: Now all men cannot pretend a right to a Mystical, much less to a Mediatory Priesthood, but only such, as have a divine appointment and designation to this Office; for the nature of Types and Mysteries is lost, if the Person be not fitted to the Mystery, and the vertue of the Mediation is lost, (at least our absolute assurance of it) if the Person do not act by Authority and Commission: But now under the Gospel, the Institutions of our Saviour are plain and simple, without any shadows and figures, and therefore there is nothing in the nature of the Worship, which requires peculiar and appropriate Persons; and Christ is now our only Mediator between God and men, and therefore we need not any other

other Mediators of divine appointment, in vertue of the Sacrifice and Mediation of Chriſt, every Chriſtian is a Prieſt, who may approach the Throne of Grace, and offer up his prayers and thankſgivings in an acceptable manner to God. Goſpel-Miniſters indeed are to pray for the People, and to bleſs in God's name, but they pray in no ſenſe as Mediators, but in the name of our great Mediator? and that, which makes their Prayers more effectual than the Prayers of a private Chriſtian, is, that they are the publick Miniſters of the Church, and therefore offer up the Prayers of the Church, which are more powerful than the Prayers of private Chriſtians. Cap. 5.

And therefore St. *Auſtin* reproves *Parmenianus* the Donatiſt, for making the Biſhop a Mediator between God and the People, which no good Chriſtian can endure the thoughts of, but muſt needs account ſuch a man rather to be Antichriſt, than an Apoſtle of Chriſt. For all Chriſtian men pray for each other, but he who prays for all, and none for him, is the only and the true Mediator; of whom the High Prieſt under the Law was a Type, and therefore no man was to pray for the High- *Auguſt. contra. ep. Parmen. l. 1. cap. 8.*

Cap. 5. High-Prieſt. But St. *Paul*, who knew, that Chriſt was our only Mediator, who was entred into Heaven for us, recommends himſelf to the Prayers of the Church; and is ſo far from making himſelf a Mediator between God and the People, that he exhorts all Chriſtians to pray for one another, as members of the ſame Body; for if *Paul* had been a Mediator, the other Apoſtles had been Mediators too, and ſo we ſhould have a great many Mediators, and not, as he himſelf tells us, one Mediator; and therefore he ſays, that the Prayers of wicked Biſhops are heard for the People, not for the Biſhop's ſake, but *pro devotione populorum*, for the Peoples Devotion, or as they are the Prayers of the Church. And when the *Donatiſts* proved, that wicked Biſhops could not miniſter in holy things, becauſe under the Law no man was to officiate as a Prieſt, who had any blemiſh or defect, he anſwers, that this was only Typical of Chriſt, and fulfilled only in him.

Ib. cap. 7.

So that the Apoſtolical or Epiſcopal Office, though it be frequently by the Ancients called *Sacerdotium*, in alluſion to the Aaronical Prieſthood, yet indeed it

it hath nothing of the proper nature of the Aaronical Prieſthood in it, but is inſtituted by Chriſt for Inſtruction, Diſcipline, and Government, and the publick Adminiſtration of religious Offices. It was very requiſite indeed, that Chriſt himſelf ſhould inveſt the Governors of his Church with Authority and Power for this Office, and it is neceſſary to the Peace, Order, and Unity of the Church, that no man ſhould uſurp this Power and Authority to himſelf, but receive it from the hands of thoſe, who have Power to give it; and therefore this Apoſtolical Power, excepting the caſe of neceſſity, is as ſacred and inviolable as the Prieſthood it ſelf; but in caſe of neceſſity, where the ſucceſſion of Apoſtolical Power fails, or a plenary Authority to convey it, it admits of a more eaſie redreſs, than the failure of a Myſtical or Typical Prieſthood would do: For there is no Office of Religion, but in ſuch a caſe any Chriſtian may perform, we being all Prieſts to God through Jeſus Chriſt; and as for Authority, neceſſity and the deſignation of fit Perſons by the Church, when the regular ways of conveyance fail, may be very eaſily Cap. 5.

Cap. 5. presumed to be approved and confirmed by God.

This I take to be the true sence of *Tertullian*'s argument, which I have explained the more largely, because some men are very apt to abuse all such passages to the diminution of the Ministerial Office, though with what little reason, I think, is very evident; but whatever becomes of *Tertullian*'s Argument, or whether the Church proceeded upon these Principles, or not in granting Liberty to Lay-men, to baptize in case of necessity, the Practise of the Church is plain in this matter, thus it was in *Tertullian*'s time, and thus it has been in most Ages of the Church ever since, and is to this day allowed in the Church of *Rome*; and if the Church allows Lay-men in case of necessity to administer Sacraments; we may reasonably presume, it will in the same necessity allow of the Ordinations of Presbyters.

Dr Potter of Ch gouvernm. p. 257.

I shall only observe further, that this practise of the Church in allowing the baptism of Lay-men in case of necessity, seems to me utterly to overthrow those Principles, which a learned Author has Published in his late Discourse

courſe of Schiſm. Some of his Princi- Cap. 5. m^r God well.
ples are theſe; That Salvation is not ordinarily to be expected without an external participation of the Sacraments. That the Validity of the Sacraments, depends upon the Authority of the Perſons by whom they are adminiſtred; they being the Seals of the Covenant, which as in all Covenants between man and man, are void in Law, if they be not applyed by Perſons, who have Authority to ſeal. This Authority of applying the Seals of the Covenant can be derived only from God, and that only by Epiſcopal Ordinations.

Now I muſt profeſs my diſſent from this Learned man upon more accounts than one, at preſent it may ſuffize, that either theſe Principles are falſe, or the Catholick Church has been in a dangerous miſtake, in allowing the Baptiſm of private Chriſtians, where there were no Eccleſiaſtical Miniſters to do it. For if the Validity of Baptiſm depends upon the Authority of him, who baptizes, then the Baptiſm of Lay-men, who according to his Principles can have no ſuch Authority, muſt be actually void, and have no ſaving effect, and then the Catholick Church ever ſince *Tertullian's*

Cap. 5. time has erred in a matter necessary to Salvation: And how specious soever any Arguments may be, I shall be always jealous of such a Conclusion, as charges the Primitive and Catholick Church with ignorance and error, so dangerous and destructive to mens Souls.

Mr Dodwell Separation of Churches, &c. p. 143. This learned man was aware of this, and therefore confesses, *For my part I do not understand, how the validity of Laicks, and much more womens Baptism (who by the Apostles rule are much less capable of Ecclesiastical Authority) can be defended, unless it may possibly be by that general delegation, which may be conceived to have been granted to them by the Governors, by those customs and constitutions, which permit them to administer it. But it would then be a further doubt, how far such Persons as these are capable of such a delegation? To which I do not intend at present to digress.* But indeed this had been no digression, or the most useful digression in all his Book. The matter of Fact is confessed by him, that in case of necessity Laicks were allowed to baptize, which overthrows his whole Hypothesis, whereby he confines this to Ecclesiastical Ministers in all cases whatsoever.

ſoever. If the Church in caſe of neceſ- Cap. 5.
ſity has permitted Laicks to baptize, we may preſume, that in the ſame neceſſity, ſhe will allow Presbyters to Ordain; if Laicks are not capable of ſuch a delegation, then the Catholick Church has erred in a fundamental Practiſe, which is neceſſary to Salvation; if they be, then the adminiſtration of Sacraments is not in all caſes abſolutely confined to the Clergy, for all ſuch caſes muſt be excepted, wherein the Church has Power to diſpenſe; for this delegated Power does not make them Eccleſiaſtical Officers, but gives Authority or Permiſſion to Laicks in ſuch caſes to do the work of a Biſhop, or of other conſecrated Perſons.

And yet we find the firſt Foundations of a very great Church, laid in this manner by *Frumentius* in *India*, who was only a Laick, and yet erected Churches, whether thoſe Chriſtians, whom he found there reſorted, to pray to God after the manner of the Church

Dum regni gubernacula Frumentius haberet in manibus Deo mentem ejus & animos inſtigante, requirere ſollicitius cæpit, ſi qui inter negotiatores Romanos Chriſtiani eſſent, & ipſis poteſtatem maximam dare, ac monere ut Conventicula per loca ſingula facerent, ad quæ Romano ritu orationis cauſa conflluerent. Ruff. l. 10. Hiſt. Eccl.

of

Cap. 5.

of *Rome*, which in thoſe days was performed with the celebration of the Euchariſt, and yet they had no Biſhop, nor Presbyter among them; and though *Ruffinus* mentions only their meeting together, to pray after the manner of the Church of *Rome*, yet what that means, *Theodoret* tells us more expreſly, that they met together after the manner of the Church of *Rome*, to celebrate all religious Offices, τὸ τὰς ἱερὰς ἐπιτελεῖν λειτουργίας, which in the ancient Language peculiarly ſignifies the Celebration of the Euchariſt.

Theodor. hiſt. Eccl. l. 1. cap. 23.

Our Author acknowledges, *That when all diligence is uſed in ſecuring Succeſſion, there may yet be real failures in it. But as God only can know them, ſo I cannot but think him obliged, both by his Covenant for the graces conveyed in the Sacraments, and by his deſign of eſtabliſhing Government through all Ages of ſucceſſion to ſupply thoſe failures.* So that it ſeems, there is great reaſon in ſome caſes, that God ſhould ſupply the failures of a valid Authority; that God ſhould make and account thoſe Sacraments valid, which have not the validity of a juſt Authority: And if this may be done in any caſe, certainly the caſe

Dodwell's Separation of Churches, &c. p. 417.

caſe of neceſſity is as conſiderable as any: Cap. 5.
And the neceſſity of preſerving the being of the Church, ſeems to me as conſiderable, as the preſervation of Government, which is only in order to the preſervation of its being.

But this is a matter of ſuch great moment, that I cannot paſs it over without a more particular Examination of ſome Principles, on which that learned man grounds that ſevere concluſion of the Invalidity of all Sacraments, which are not adminiſtred by Biſhops, or by Presbyters Epiſcopally Ordained; which, I hope, I may do in ſuch a Cauſe as this, wherein ſo many foreign Churches are concerned, without the leaſt infringement of that real honour and friendſhip I have for him. And to proceed with all poſſible clearneſs in this matter, I ſhall reduce the ſtate of the Controverſie between us to a narrow point, and briefly ſhew, wherein we agree, and wherein we differ.

1. Then I readily grant, that the external participation of the Chriſtian Sacraments, of Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper, is ordinarily neceſſary to Salvation.

Cap. 5. 2. I grant alſo, that the Biſhops and Miniſters of the Church regularly ordained, have the only ordinary Power of adminiſtring Sacraments, and that all Sacraments adminiſtred and received in oppoſition to, and contempt of the ordinary Governors of the Church, are invalid, or inefficacious.

The Validity of ye Sacram^ts depend not on ye Authority of ye Person administring.

3. But I abſolutely deny, that the validity of the Sacraments depends upon the Authority of the Perſons adminiſtring. This is the parting point, and therefore muſt be carefully examined. And I find but two general Arguments this learned man uſes for the Proof of it. From the nature of the Sacraments, and from the ends of Government, conſidering God as a Covenanter, and as a Governor.

1. From the nature of the Sacraments, or conſidering God as a Covenanter; and ſo the adminiſtration of Sacraments is celebrating or making a Covenant in God's Name, ſo as to oblige him to performance of it, which no man can do, unleſs God ſignifie it to be his Pleaſure to empower him to do ſo, as in Law, no man can be obliged by anothers act, who has not been empowered to act in his Name by his Letters of

of Proxy. And he that preſumes of himſelf to make a Covenant, wherein God is by him engaged as a Party, without being ſo empowered by God, as what he does, cannot in any legal expoſition be reputed as God's act, ſo neither can it infer any legal obligation of him to performance. Cap. 5.

This Argument is drawn out to a great length, but this I take to be the ſum of it, and it were a very ſtrong Argument, if the Foundation of it were not falſe; but I muſt deny that, which this Author has all along taken for granted without any Proof; that the adminiſtration of the Sacraments, as ſuppoſe of Baptiſm, is the Miniſters making a Covenant with the Perſon baptized in God's Name.

I know of but one Covenant, which God has made with mankind in Chriſt Jeſus, and that is the Goſpel-Covenant; and I know of but one ſealing and confirmation of this Covenant, and that is by the Blood of Chriſt; and therefore the Sacraments cannot be ſuch Seals, as ratifie and confirm the Covenant, and give validity to it, or paſs an Obligation on God to ſtand to his Covenant. The Chriſtian Sacraments are neceſſary parts,

Cap. 5. parts, duties, or conditions of the Covenant, either for our admiſſion to the Priviledges, or conveyance of the Grace of the Covenant, and therefore they cannot in a proper ſence be Seals of, or making a Covenant in God's Name. All mankind are capable of being received into this Covenant; the Covenant is actually made to the Chriſtian Church, and every Member of it; Baptiſm is our admiſſion into the Chriſtian Church, and conſequently to all the priviledges of the Covenant; it is very fitting, that the ordinary Power of ſuch admiſſions ſhould be in the hands of Church Governors, and ſo it is by divine appointment, but all this is a very different thing, from making a Covenant in God's Name, which ſhall validly oblige God to the performance of it. This, it is plain, no man can do, without the moſt expreſs Authority, but the external ſolemnities of a Covenant, which are ratified, confirmed, commanded by God, need not in all caſes ſuch expreſs Authority; for in this caſe we do not preſume to make a Covenant in God's Name, or to oblige him by our Act, but only to do what he has required and commanded to be done, though not expreſly com-

commanded us in particular to do it. Cap. 5.
We neither make any new terms for God, which he has not already made, and obliged himſelf to the performance of, nor admit any Perſons to the Priviledges of this Covenant, whom God has excluded, for the Covenant is made with all mankind, who believe the Goſpel, but we only do the ordinary work of Church Governors, without the regular Authority of Governors, upon a reaſonable preſumption, that God will allow of this, where there are not ordinary Governors to do it: Which is a reaſonable preſumption in all humane Governments, where a regular Authority fails, and cannot be ſupplyed in an ordinary way; a Topick, which this learned Author makes great and frequent uſe of.

And methinks, it might ſatisfie any reaſonable man, what a vaſt difference there is between making a Covenant in God's Name, and performing ſome external Solemnities of it, if he only conſider that Covenant, which God made with *Abraham*, and the ſign of this Covenant, which was Circumciſion, a Seal of the righteouſneſs of Faith.

What-

Cap. 5. Whatever this learned man urges to prove the neceſſity of a valid Authority in the Adminiſtrator to make Baptiſm valid, will prove the ſame neceſſity of a valid Authority to make Circumciſion valid; for what Baptiſm is in the new Covenant, that Circumciſion was in God's Covenant with *Abraham*, both equally alike Signs or Seals or external Solemnities of the Covenant; and yet it is ſufficiently known, that any *Iſraelite* might circumciſe, that underſtood how to do it.

Buxtorfii Synagoga Judaica, cap. 4. p. 90.

The Adminiſtration of Baptiſm indeed is confined ordinarily to the Governors of the Church, whereas the adminiſtration of Circumciſion never was the peculiar Office of the Prieſt, and the reaſon of this difference is plain, becauſe every *Iſraelite* by birth had a right to Circumciſion, and therefore there was no need of any Authority to receive them into the Church of *Iſrael*, and the external Solemnity might be performed by any man; but natural Generation does not give any man a right to Baptiſm, but Faith in Chriſt, and therefore it is fit, that the Governors of the Church only ſhould have Power to judge, who are fit to be admitted

mitted into the Chriſtian Church, and therefore that the power of adminiſtring Baptiſm ſhould be reſerved in their hands; but hence it appears, that in adminiſtring the Sacraments, they do not act, as legal Covenanters in God's Name, but as Governors of the Church. Cap. 5.

2. And this brings me to conſider his Arguments from the Nature and Ends of Government, which as far as I underſtand them amount to this. That it is neceſſary for God to maintain and preſerve the Authority of ſubordinate Governors. That the Authority of Church Governors conſiſts in the power of adminiſtring Sacraments, which confer a Title to all the Priviledges and Graces of the Covenant. That this Authority cannot be maintained, if unauthorized Perſons may validly adminiſter the Sacraments, and therefore we cannot ſuppoſe, that God will countenance ſuch an uſurpation of Eccleſiaſtical Authority, as to confirm and allow, what is ſo illegally done.

Now in Anſwer to this, I readily grant, 1. That this is a very good Argument to prove, that the Authority of adminiſtring Sacraments is in ordinary

nary

Cap. 5. nary caſes confined to the regular Clergy, for indeed this is all the Authority Church Governors have, to receive in, and to put out of the Church, and take away this, and all Church-ſocieties muſt immediately diſſolve, or hang together only by ſome arbitrary Compacts and Covenants, which laſt as long as every man pleaſes.

But then 2. I obſerve, that it is ſufficient to ſecure the Authority and Government of the Church, to confine the adminiſtration of Sacraments, and all acts of Eccleſiaſtical Authority to Church-Governors, where-ever there are ſuch to be found. For if no private man muſt preſume to adminiſter Sacraments in a conſtituted Church, where there are Eccleſiaſtical Miniſters, though we grant Laicks the liberty of adminiſtring Sacraments, where there are no regular Miniſters to do it; this can be no reaſonable pretence for their invading the Miniſterial Function, or diſturbing the Peace and Order of the Church, where there are. He who attributes the only valid Authority of adminiſtring Sacraments to the regular Clergy, where there are ſuch Perſons to be found, does as effectually ſecure the

the Authority of Church-Governors, as he, who makes it abſolutely unlawful for private Chriſtians, in any caſe whatſoever, to adminiſter the Sacraments. For the Authority of Church-governors is a meer notion without any effect, where there are no ſuch Governors, and where there are, their Authority is ſecure this way. No man thinks it any injury to the Authority of Princes and Civil Governors, to aſſert, that every private man has liberty to defend his own Life and Fortune, where he is not under the protection of Laws, and publick Juſtice, no more is it any invaſion of the Authority of the Clergy, for private Chriſtians to do the Office of a Biſhop or a Presbyter, where there is no Biſhop or Presbyter to do it. No doubt, but God is greatly concerned to maintain the Authority of Church-governors, becauſe the welfare and preſervation of the Church depends on it, but we cannot think, the Rules of Order and Government are ſo ſtrict, as to diſſolve the Society of the Church, which it is deſigned to maintain. Cap. 5.

If it be objected, that it is very dangerous to Eccleſiaſtical Authority, to grant the leaſt indulgence or liberty to Laicks,

Cap. 5. Laicks, or an irregular Clergy, in any case whatsoever, to intermeddle in sacred Offices; for they will always be apt to take more than is granted; and thus that Liberty, which is allowed in extraordinary cases, will be improved into an ordinary usurpation of the Ministerial Office. I answer, It may be so, and I know no way to prevent those ill Consequences, which fooliſh Reasoners may draw from Truth it self, nor that ill use, which wild and giddy People may make of the justest Liberties, but must we deny Truth, or deny our own just Liberties and Rights for this reason?

But yet this is not the case here, for there is a greater security of Ecclesiastical Authority, than the Power of Sacraments its self, and that is, the necessary obligations to Catholick Communion, which cannot be preserved without a just deference to Ecclesiastical Authority: It may be lawful in some cases for Laicks to administer the Sacraments, but it is never lawful for them to separate from their Governors, or to oppose their Authority.

Should

Should a company of private Chriſtians on their own choice ſeparate themſelves from their Biſhops, and unite into a Church-Society, this were a Church-Faction and Schiſm, and all they did were null and void; but if private Chriſtians, who live in Communion with their Biſhops, and own their Authority, being reduced to that neceſſity, that they cannot enjoy the Sacraments, nor other religious Offices from Perſons, who have a regular Authority, ſhould adminiſter the Sacraments themſelves, and celebrate religious Offices for their ſpiritual Comfort, I cannot ſee, that it is either Schiſm, or Uſurpation, and the perpetual obligations to Catholick Communion will prevent both. Cap. 5.

Indeed nothing can ſecure the Peace and Unity of the Church, and the Authority of Eccleſiaſtical Governors, but the neceſſity of Catholick Communion; for the Unity of the Church, and the juſt Authority of Biſhops, may be deſtroyed by an Epiſcopal, as well as by a Presbyterian, or a Lay Schiſm. Thus it was by the Schiſm of the *Donatiſts*. They were governed by Biſhops, as well as the Catholick Church, and their Orders, and Sacraments adminiſtred by

Cap. 5. them were allowed to be valid, and yet they were Schiſmaticks, and their Sacraments, though valid with reſpect to the Authority, which adminiſtred them, yet without effect, as adminiſtred in a Schiſm, as I have already ſhewed from St. *Auſtin.* And therefore that Father in his Writings againſt the *Donatiſts*, does not oppoſe their Schiſm from the Invalidity of their Orders, or of their Sacraments, which is no argument againſt an Epiſcopal Schiſm, (though it be the only argument uſed by this learned man, to ſhew the evil and danger of Schiſm) but from their breach of Catholick Communion, which made all their Sacraments, though not invalid, yet inefficacious. So that Eccleſiaſtical Authority may be ſecured, though we allow Laicks in caſe of neceſſity a liberty to adminiſter Sacraments in the Unity and Communion of the Church.

It were eaſie to add a great deal more of this Nature, but this is ſufficient to my preſent deſign. And the reſult of this whole Diſcourſe is, that it is not in all caſes and circumſtances unlawful to maintain Catholick Communion with ſuch a Church, as being forced to it by neceſſity, is neither governed by Biſhops,

ſhops, nor by Presbyters Epiſcopally ordained. Cap. 5.

III. There ſtill remains the third and fourth terms of Catholick Communion to be conſidered, the Diſcipline of the Church, and Eccleſiaſtical Rites and Ceremonies, which I ſhall briefly ſpeak to both together.

Now Diſcipline in the ancient uſe of the Word has a large ſignification, and includes all religious Worſhip, as well as Church Cenſures, eſpecially the Chriſtian Sacraments; for Church Diſcipline conſiſts in admitting men to, or excluding them from the Communion, Worſhip, and Sacraments of Chriſtians. Thus *Diſciplina ſacerdotis*, in *Tertullian* ſignifies the whole exerciſe of the Prieſtly Office, even the adminiſtration of Sacraments, of Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper. And by Eccleſiaſtical Rites and Ceremonies, I mean ſuch external circumſtances and appendages of Worſhip, Time, Place, Habits, Poſtures, or ſignificant Rites, as are of humane Inſtitution, and may be either enjoyned or altered by Church Governors, and do actually differ according to the Cuſtoms of ſeveral Churches.

Cap. 5. Now to reduce what I have to ſay under this Head, into as narrow a compaſs as I can, I ſhall premiſe ſeveral things, which I preſume will be acknowledged without a Proof by the Perſons I have now to deal with.

1. That it is neceſſary to Catholick Communion, that every Church obſerve all the eſſentials of Chriſtian Worſhip, and particularly the Chriſtian Sacraments, as inſtituted by our Saviour.

2. That their Worſhip be pure from all Idolatrous mixtures, and corruptions; which is a ſufficient juſtification of our ſeparation from the Church of *Rome*.

3. I ſuppoſe, it will be granted alſo, that there is no Church ſo pure, but that it has bad men, and too often bad Miniſters in its Communion.

4. That there have in all ages been various Rites and Ceremonies uſed in the Chriſtian Church, and very different in different Churches. This no man will deny, but one, who is either very ignorant himſelf, or a very impudent impoſer upon the ignorance of others.

5. That

5. That among true and orthodox Churches, which believe all the Fundamentals of Faith, and obſerve all the Eſſentials of Worſhip, there are different degrees of purity in Diſcipline, and Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions and Ceremonies, ſome more, ſome leſs, for the edification of the Church. Cap. 5.

This having been in former Ages, and being now at preſent the ſtate of the Chriſtian Church, it is evident, what a Catholick Chriſtian muſt do, who will maintain Catholick Communion with the ſeveral Chriſtian Churches in the World.

As, 1. He muſt communicate with Churches, which are not ſo ſtrict and regular in their Diſcipline, as he could wiſh. There being few Churches in the World, ſo exact in this matter, but a wiſe and good man may diſcover ſuch defects in their Diſcipline, as he could wiſh amended. And he, who will not communicate with any Church, nor live in any Common-wealth, which has any defects in its Government, is not fit to live in this World, where there is no abſolute perfection to be found, either in Church or State.

Cap. 5.

2. He must communicate with such Churches, wherein there are a great many bad, as well as good men, for this is the state of all Churches on Earth, where the Tares grow up with the Wheat.

3. They must communicate with Churches, which observe several uncommanded and significant Ceremonies, for thus most Churches in the World do, and have always done.

4. Nay they must communicate with Churches, which have very different, if not contrary Customs. There being few Churches, wherein the external Modes, Rites, and Ceremonies of Worship are in all things alike.

It is evident, as any matter of Fact can be, that no true Christian Churches in the World, can communicate with each other upon any other terms than these, and therefore it is a vain thing to talk of any other, and to condemn these terms of Communion, as unlawful, makes Catholick Communion impossible.

Whoever separates from any Church, upon a pretence of some defects and imperfections in Worship or Discipline, when all the essentials of Christian Worship

ſhip are preſerved entire and pure, without any ſuch corrupt mixtures as make their Worſhip ſinful; whoever ſeparates from a Church, becauſe there are a great many bad men in it, or for the ſake of ſome indifferent Cuſtoms, and ſignificant Ceremonies, muſt for the ſame reaſon ſeparate from all the Churches in the World, even from the moſt Primitive and Apoſtolical Churches of the firſt ages of Chriſtianity. Cap. 5.

Now if Catholick Communion be ſo eſſential to the being and notion of the Catholick Church, thoſe Principles muſt be falſe and Schiſmatical, which are ſo irreconcileable with Catholick Communion. For it is plain we cannot at this day, nor ever could, communicate with the Catholick Church, if every defect in Worſhip or Diſcipline, if indifferent rites and uſages in religious Worſhip, if corrupt and vicious Members make the Communion of any Church unlawful, and be a juſt reaſon for Separation.

This indeed has always been the pretence both of ancient and modern Schiſmaticks. The *Novatians* and *Donatiſts* ſeparated for a ſtricter Diſcipline, and purer Communion, and were condemn-

Cap. 5. ed for it by the Catholick Church. And St. *Auſtin* proves at large againſt the *Donatiſts*, that neither the wickedneſs of the Miniſter, nor of the People, corrupt the Worſhip, or make the Communion of ſuch a Church ſinful, though through the defect of Diſcipline, the one ſhould not be depoſed, nor the other removed from Chriſtian Communion.

For indeed the ancient Fathers thought Catholick Communion ſo abſolutely neceſſary, that very few things could come in Competition with it. We have a famous example of this in St. *Cyprian*, who diſputed very earneſtly for the neceſſity of baptizing thoſe, who had been baptized by Hereticks, whenever they returned to the Communion of the Church. *Stephen* Biſhop of *Rome* did as vehemently oppoſe it, with ſome ſharp reflexions upon St. *Cyprian*, and did admit thoſe to Communion without Baptiſm, who had been baptized by Hereticks. But St. *Cyprian*, like a true Catholick Chriſtian, declares in his Preface to the Council of Carthage, that

Cyprian. 73, 106

Neminem judicantes, aut à jure communionis aliquem, ſi diverſum ſenſerit, amoventes, præfat. Concil. Carth.

he

he would not deny Communion to any of his Colleagues, who differed from him in this point. And in his Letter to *Jubaianus*, he profeſſes that he will not quarrel with his Colleagues for the ſake of Hereticks. And yet as St. *Auſtin* well obſerves, this Diſpute was of great conſequence to the Communion of the Church: For if St. *Cyprian* was in the right, then the Biſhop of *Rome*, who received thoſe to Communion without Baptiſm, who had been formerly baptized by Hereticks, received thoſe to Communion, who never had any valid Baptiſm, and yet St. *Cyprian*, who did believe this, rather choſe to communicate with that Church, which admitted unbaptized Perſons into her Communion, than to diſturb the Peace, and divide the Communion of the Chriſtian Church. For indeed that Father lookt upon the Communion of the Church, as neceſſary and effectual to Salvation, as the Sacraments themſelves, nay able to ſupply the defects of Sacraments. For in his Epiſtle to *Jubaianus*, in anſwer to that Queſtion, what ſhall become of thoſe, who have formerly been

Cap. 5.

Nos, quantum in nobis eſt, propter Hereticos cum Collegis & coepiſcopis noſtris non contendimus, cum quibus divinam concordiam & dominicam pacem tenemus. Cyp. ep. ad. Jubai.

Auguſt. de baptiſmo. l. 2.

Cap. 5. been received into the Church without Baptiſm, he tells him, *the Lord is able of his own mercy to grant Pardon and Indulgence to thoſe, who returning to the Church, and being only barely admitted to the Communion of it, dyed in its Peace and Communion, and not to ſeparate them from the Rewards of his Church.* That is, that living in Communion with the Church, is able to ſupply even the want of Baptiſm it ſelf. And St. *Auſtin* diſcourſes very much to the ſame purpoſe; and obſerves, that whatever different apprehenſions we may have of many things, the ſafeſt way is to continue in the Communion of the Church, which will ſanctifie our very errors and miſtakes. To be ſure you cannot name any thing in Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline of greater moment, than this Diſpute about the re-baptization of Hereticks, and yet St. *Cyprian* did not think this a ſufficient reaſon to break Communion. In a Word, nothing can be better ſaid about Diſcipline, than what St. *Auſtin* has obſerved; that many times things are at that paſs, that

Hominis enim ſumus, unde aliquid aliter ſapere, quam ſe res habet, humana tentatio eſt, nimis autem amando ſententiam ſuam, vel invidendo melioribus uſq; ad præcidenda communionis, & condendi ſchiſmatis vel hæreſis ſacrilegium pervenire, diabolica præſumptio eſt. Aug. de bapt. l. 2. cap. 5.

Aug. contra Parmeniani epiſt. l. 2. cap. 11.

that it is neceſſary to looſen the reins of Diſcipline to prevent a Schiſm, which an unſeaſonable ſeverity may threaten the Church with; the number of bad men in a Church may make Diſcipline unpracticable in ſome caſes, and it is better for good men to tolerate the bad, who cannot defile their Communion, than to break communion with thoſe who are good. Cap. 5.

As for Eccleſiaſtical Rites and Ceremonies, there is an admirable Epiſtle of St. *Auſtin* to *Januarius*, which ſtates this whole matter. He firſt obſerves, that the Yoke of Chriſt is very eaſie and gentle; that he has united his Church into one Body and Society, by very few Sacraments, eaſie to be obſerved, and excellent in their ſignification, ſuch as Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper, or whatever other obſervances we find enjoyned in the holy Scripture, excepting the ſervitude of the *Moſaick* Law. *Aug. ep. Januario* 118.

But there are other things obſerved by the Church, which are not written in the Scriptures, but received by tradition, and ſuch obſervances as theſe, which are received by the whole Catholick Church, are either of Apoſtolical Inſtitution, or the Decrees of General

Cap. 5. ral Councils, which have the greateſt and moſt beneficial Authority in the Church. Such are the Annual Solemnities in memory of the Paſſion, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion of our Lord, and the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon the Apoſtles, which are obſerv'd in all parts of the Church. For it ſeems, in St. *Auſtin's* time the ſuperſtition of theſe days had not been diſcovered.

But there are ſome Cuſtoms, which are obſerved differently in ſeveral Churches. As ſome faſt on the Saturday, others do not. Some receive the Communion of the Body and Blood of Chriſt every day, others only at certain times, others only on Saturday, and Sunday, others only on Sundays. Now all things of this nature, may be obſerved either one way or other; nor is there any better Rule for a grave and prudent Chriſtian in ſuch matters, than to obſerve the cuſtom of the Church, in which he lives, or whither he travels. For whatever is commanded, which is neither contrary to Faith, nor to good Manners, is to be accounted indifferent, and

Totum hoc genus rerum liberas habet obſervationes, nec diſciplina ullæ eſt in his melior gravi prudentiq; Chriſtiano, quàm ut eo modo agat, quo agere viderit ecclesiam, ad quamcunq; forte devenerit. Ib.

and to be obſerved for the preſervation of the Communion in which we live. And this St. *Auſtin* confirms with that ſage Advice he received from St. *Ambroſe*, when he was at *Milan*, which he ſays, he always, as often as he thought of it, took for a divine Oracle. For the Church of *Milan* did not faſt on the Saturday, according to the cuſtom of many other Churches, and St. *Auſtin*'s Mother following him thither, and being uncertain what ſhe ſhould do; whether obſerve the cuſtom of her own Church, to faſt on Saturday, or the cuſtom of the Church of *Milan*, where ſhe then was, not to do it; he conſulted St. *Ambroſe* about it, who returned him this anſwer. When I am at *Rome*, I faſt on Saturdays, when I am here, I do not. And thus I would have you do, to obſerve the Cuſtom of the Church, whither you come, if you would neither be a ſcandal to others, nor have them a ſcandal to you. A great deal more to this purpoſe there is in that excellent Epiſtle, and indeed theſe are the only terms of Catholick Communion. For if every dif-

Quod enim neq; contra fidem, neq; contra bonos mores injungitur, indifferenter eſt habendum, & pro eorum inter quos vivitur ſocietate ſervandum eſt.

Cap. 6. different Cuſtom, Uſage, and Ceremony in a Church, ſhall cauſe a Separation, there are few Churches can live in Communion with each other. And thus I hope, I have made it appear, that Catholick Communion is not an impracticable notion, but is indeed as eaſie, as it is neceſſary to be obſerved.

CHAP. VI.

An Examination of Mr. Lob's *ſuggeſtions to prove the Diſſenters, according to my own Principles, to be no Schiſmaticks, and a further inquiry who is the divider.*

IT will not be amiſs now after all this grave and ſerious Diſcourſe, to divert my Readers a little with a more pleaſant and entertaining Scene. For Mr. *Lob* ſeems to me to be a great Droll, and to maintain a Diſpute by the irreſiſtible power of Wit, and pleaſant Conceits, where Arguments fail. It is wonderful to obſerve with what admirable art and dexterity he has retorted my Arguments upon my ſelf, and given life to a dying and languiſhing Cauſe, with the

the ſame Weapons, which gave it its mortal Wound. I thought, I had proved our Diſſenters, who ſeparate from the Church of *England*, to be Schiſmaticks, as far as proving their Separation to be Schiſm, and anſwering their ſeveral Pleas for Separation, proved them Schiſmaticks; but Mr. *Lob* has diſcovered, that I have been kinder to them, than I was aware of, and by my own Principles have excuſed them from Schiſm, which, I aſſure you, if it prove ſo, will be the beſt Confutation of my Principles, and make me greatly ſuſpect them my ſelf. There are ſeveral inſinuations of this nature ſcattered here and there in his reply, which require no very ſerious anſwer; for if he deſigned them for ſerious Arguments, he is a wit indeed. As to give ſome inſtances of this nature. Cap. 6.

1. He ſays, I place *Schiſm in a ſeparating from the Catholick Church, which notion taken ſingly will ſtand the Diſſenters, and all true Chriſtians, who muſt be acknowledged to be Members of the Catholick Church, in great ſtead, freeing them from the odious ſin of Schiſm. The Diſſenters divide not themſelves from the Communion of the Univerſal Church*, ergo not Reply, p. 13.

Cap. 6. *not Schiſmaticks.* Now I would deſire all Diſſenters to remember, what Mr. *Lob* grants; that there is ſuch a ſin as Schiſm, and that it is a very odious ſin, which would ſtand them in more ſtead, if they ſeriouſly thought of it, than his Defence and Apology will do.

But Diſſenters, he ſays, do not divide themſelves from the Communion of the Univerſal Church: What he means by this I cannot well tell, for I am ſure, their Principles, upon which they divide from the Church of *England*, do equally divide them from all the Churches in the World: And if upon meer humour they will divide from one Church, and not from another, where the reaſon of Separation is the ſame, they are nevertheleſs Schiſmaticks for that. Let Mr. *Lob* tell me, what Church for above twelve hundred years, they could have communicated with upon ſo good terms, as they may now with the Church of *England*? If Dioceſan Epiſcopacy, Forms of Prayer, Defects in Diſcipline, Corrupt Members in Church Communion, Eccleſiaſtical Rites and Ceremonies, or unſcriptural Impoſitions, as they call them, be a ſufficient reaſon to juſtifie Separation, what Church

The Schismatical Principles of the Diſſenters. 390. 413. *Supr.* 336, 7

393

Church they ever could, or can to this day communicate with? The Foreign Proteſtant Churches, though they differ in ſome things from the Church of *England*, not in Judgment, but in Practiſe, of which I have given ſome account above, yet they communicate with the Church of *England*, which according to the Laws of Catholick Communion, makes it as unlawful to communicate with them, as with the Church of *England* it ſelf. Cap. 6.

But he ſays, *Diſſenters, and all true Chriſtians (though I hope, all true Chriſtians are not Diſſenters, whether Diſſenters be true Chriſtians or not) muſt be acknowledged to be members of the Catholick Church*: How far this muſt be acknowledged, I have examined above; Schiſmaticks in a looſe general Notion belong to the Church, though they are not Members of the Catholick Church, which is but one Communion; and thus diſſenting Separatiſts are Schiſmaticks ſtill. 69

But though it were poſſible, that our Diſſenters might find ſome other Church, beſide their own Conventicles, to communicate with, yet they actually divide themſelves from the Catholick

Cap. 6. Church, by breaking Communion with any one ſound part of it, eſpecially with ſuch a part of the Church, as they are more particularly bound to communicate with. The Catholick Church is but one Communion, and whoever cauſeleſly breaks this Communion, as he does, who ſeparates from any ſound part of the Church, is a Schiſmatick, eſpecially he that ſeparates from the Church wherein he lives, which is the caſe of our Diſſenters in ſeparating from the Church of *England*. If you ſeparate the Arm from the Shoulder, you ſeparate it from the whole Body; the Union of every Member with the Body, is its Union to that part of the Body which is next; for the whole Body is nothing elſe, but all the parts united to each other in their proper place and order: And if the Church be one Body, and one Communion, he that ſeparates from the Communion of the Church, where he lives, is a Schiſmatick, though he may pretend to an imaginary Communion with *French* or *Dutch* Churches, with the Churches of *Greece* or *Ruſſia*.

But

But as much as Mr. *Lob* pretends, that notion will ſtand the Diſſenters in ſtead, that Schiſm is a Separation from the Catholick Church, it is plain, he does not like it, and therefore reproaches it, as a Popiſh notion, generally aſſerted by Papiſts: I ſhould be heartily glad to ſee any Papiſt aſſert this, for it would bid fair to put an end to Popery; but I doubt, Mr. *Lob* wrongs the Papiſts, and miſtakes Catholick for *Roman-Catholick* Church: They own no Catholick, but the *Roman-Catholick* Church, and know no Schiſm, but a Separation from the Church of *Rome*. Cap. 6.

But Mr. *Lob* thinks this is no great matter; for I only change *England* for *Rome*, and ſet up an *Engliſh-Catholick*, inſtead of the *Roman-Catholick* Church, which whatever other fault it have, I hope, he will acknowledg to be a change a little for the better; but let us hear his own words. He ſays, *I cloſe with the ſame Popiſh Faction, in aſſerting, that ſeparating from the Church of* England, *is a Separation from the Catholick Church, as if the Catholick Church had been as much confined within the bounds of the Church of* England, *as the* Ibid.

Cap. 6. *piſts ſay within the limits of* Rome: What a bleſſed thing is Ignorance, which helps men to confute Books without fear or wit! What Papiſts are thoſe, who confine the Catholick Church within the limits of *Rome*? Do not they own the Churches of *Italy*, *Spain*, *France*, *Germany*, to be Catholick Churches, and would own all the Churches in the World to be ſo, would they ſubject themſelves to the Pope of *Rome*? They do not deſire to confine the Catholick Church within the limits of *Rome*, but deſire to extend it as far as *England*, and all the World over. But ſtill *Rome* is the beginning of Unity and Catholiciſm, and no Church muſt be owned for a Catholick Church, which does not live in Communion with the Church of *Rome*, and pay homage and ſubjection to the Biſhop of *Rome*: This is the *Roman-Catholick* Church, not which is confined within the limits of *Rome*, but which has the Biſhop of *Rome* for its conſtitutive Regent Head.

And is not Mr. *Lob* a very pleaſant man, who would perſwade the World, that I am for ſetting up ſuch a Catholick Church in *England*, as the Papiſts have

have done at *Rome*. The Papiſts make it Schiſm from the Catholick Church to ſeparate from the Biſhop of *Rome*, conſidered as the Head of the Church; I aſſert it to be Schiſm from the Catholick Church, to ſeparate from the Church of *England*, not meerly as the Church of *England*, but as a true and ſound part of the Catholick Church, which we eſpecially are bound to communicate with: And is there no difference between theſe two? Cap. 6.

But *who-ever ſeparates from the Church of* England, *cuts himſelf from the Catholick Church, puts himſelf out of a State of Salvation. He is* extra Eccleſiam, extra quam nulla ſalus, *they are all the while Schiſmaticks in a ſtate of Damnation*: This no jeſting matter, but a ſad and ſerious Truth, which I would beg Mr. *Lob*, as he loves his own Soul, to conſider better of at his leiſure, and out of the heat of Diſpute. Separation from the Church of *England* is a Schiſm, and Schiſm is as damning a ſin, as Idolatry, Drunkenneſs, or Adultery.

And here he has a notable fetch. *But ſurely if theſe men believed ſo much, methinks they ſhould not be at reſt, until all their unſcriptural Impoſitions were remo-*

Cap. 6. *ved, unleſs they have greater kindneſs for ſuch trifles, than they have for ſuch immortal Souls for whom Chriſt dyed.* And methinks, they ſhould be as much concerned to take care of their own Souls, as we are to take care of them, and not to divide the Church for the ſake of ſuch Trifles, as they call them. As for removing all unſcriptural Impoſitions, as he calls them, by which he means the whole Conſtitution of the Church of *England*, this we cannot do without deſtroying all the external Solemnities of Worſhip, and diſſolving the Bands of Church-Society; of which more preſently: And if this could be done, they would be Schiſmaticks ſtill, unleſs they could perſwade all the Churches in the World to do ſo too: For they could not maintain Catholick Communion with any Church, which uſed any unſcriptural Rites and Ceremonies, as moſt Churches in the World at this day do: Nay they would be Schiſmaticks from the Catholick Church for many hundred years before the Reformation; for their very Principles are Schiſmatical, and it is not the removing ſome few Ceremonies, which would cure their Schiſm. But ſuppoſe the Church of *England* were

384, 413.

out

out of their way, would that cure their Schism? would *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, and *meer Anabaptists*, cement into one Communion? We know, how it has been formerly, and have reason to guess, how it would be again; when they cease to be Schismaticks from the Church of *England*, they will be Schismaticks to one another. And therefore we may without breach of Charity defend our Church, and they are bound in Charity to look to their own Souls. Cap. 6.

And therefore I wonder, what our Author means, when he puts the whole Dispute upon this issue: *Let their terms be as Catholick, as they pretend their Church is, and we'll comply*; i. e. *let them keep to a few, certain, and necessary things; let them not impose as terms of Union, any thing but what is according to the Word of God in Scripture, we are satisfied, the Controversie is at an end.* Reply. p. 78.

This is a certain Argument, that our Author is no great Traveller, not so much as in Books; that he knows nothing of any Church, but his own dear Conventicles, unless he modestly dissembles his knowledg to serve his Cause.

Cap. 6. For the terms of our Communion are as Catholick, as our Church is; Dioceſan Epiſcopacy, Liturgies, and Ceremonies, have been received in all Churches for many hundred years, and are the ſetled Conſtitution of moſt Churches to this day; and this is the Conſtitution of the Church of *England*, and the terms of our Communion; and muſt be acknowledged to be Catholick Terms, if by Catholick Terms, he means, what has actually been received by ~~that~~ the Catholick Church, and not what he fancies, ought to be made the Terms of Catholick Communion: Could Mr. *Lob* indeed have the new Modelling of the Catholick Church, and make what Catholick Terms of Communion he pleaſed, *he would be ſatisfied, and the Controverſie were at an end*; but wiſer men conſider, that Catholick Terms of Communion are not to be made now, no more than the Catholick Faith is; and therefore it is not our private Reaſonings, but the Practiſe of the Catholick Church in all Ages, which will acquaint us, what the Catholick Terms of Communion are; and he, who will not maintain Communion with the Church upon ſuch Terms, muſt be a Schiſmatick,

tick, and there is an end of that Controverſie. Cap. 6.

And if by *according to the Word of God*, he means, that nothing muſt be made a Term of Catholick Communion, but what is agreeable to the general Rules of Scripture, I readily grant it, and aſſert, that the Church of *England* requires nothing, as a Term of Communion, but what is ſo: But if he means, that the Church muſt require nothing, but what is expreſly commanded by the Word of God,* I deny, that this ever was a Term of Catholick Communion, nay nor of any particular Church-Communion; Dr. *Owen* himſelf rejects it, and of late, it has been thought a very great Scandal upon the Diſſenters to charge them with; but it is happy for a Faction to have ſome ignorant Writers, as well as Readers; for the firſt are bold, and the other credulous, and the Argument muſt be acknowledged, to be very uſeful to divide and diſturb the beſt conſtituted Church, though wiſe and cunning men are aſhamed to uſe it. And that Mr. *L.* means this by *according to the Word of God*, appears from an admirable Argument, he uſes to prove it. That we our ſelves *look* 384

on

Cap. 6. *on them as indifferent*, i. e. *as what is not enjoyned us in the Word of God*, q. d. *as what is not according to the Word of God.*

Reply, p. 79. Which alſo he explains by *ſuch things, as are not to be found in Scripture.* Now we do indeed by indifferent things, mean ſuch things, as are not commanded in Scripture, but are left to the prudence of Governors to injoyn or alter, as the Edification of the Church ſhall require; but yet we aſſert indifferent things to be according to Scripture, both as the uſe of indifferent things is allowed in Scripture, and as theſe particular uſages, which are enjoyned by the Church, though they may be in their own natures indifferent, yet are agreeable to the general Rules of Scripture for decency and order.

But Mr. *Lob* requires us *to ſhew the Scriptures, that declare the things impoſed, to be ſo neceſſary a part of true Religion, as to be a Form of our Communion with the Catholick Church; that we*

Ibid. 78. *muſt not only ſhew, that theſe things are agreeable to true Religion, but moreover that it is ſuch a neceſſary part thereof, that whoever conforms not to them, when impoſed, is*, ipſo facto, *cut off from the Catholick Church.*

Now

Now this were ſomething to the purpoſe, did we aſſert, that the bare not doing theſe things, as for inſtance, the not wearing the Surplice, or not uſing the Croſs in Baptiſm, or not kneeling at the Sacrament, did in their own nature, *ipſo facto*, cut men off from the Catholick Church; but we never ſaid, we never thought this: But we ſay, that to ſeparate cauſeleſly from any true and ſound part of the Chriſtian Church, cuts ſuch Separatiſts off from the Catholick Church; and to ſeparate, where no ſinful terms of Communion are impoſed, is a cauſeleſs Separation. So that it does not lie on us to prove, that every thing that is injoyned, is in its own nature neceſſary to Catholick Communion; but if they would juſtifie their Separation, they muſt prove, that what is enjoyned, is ſinful. Cap. 6.

I will only ask Mr. *Lob*, whether it be a ſufficient juſtification of Separation from any Church, that there are ſuch things impoſed, as are not indeed expreſly commanded, but yet are agreeable to the Word of God, and to true Religion; if this be a juſt Cauſe of Separation, it is impoſſible, that any Schiſmatick ſhould ever want Reaſons for their

Cap. 6. their Separation; for there is no Church in the World, but does ſomething or other, which they have no Command to do: If this be no ſufficient reaſon of Separation, then it is ſufficient for us to prove, that the Church impoſes nothing, but what is agreeable to true Religion, to prove them guilty of a cauſeleſs Schiſm.

Can any thing be ſinful, which is agreeable to true Religion? Or can the Church ſin in commanding things which are not ſinful? If not, it is ſufficient to prove, that the Church impoſes nothing, but what is agreeable to true Religion: For whatever juſtifies the Church, condemns the Schiſmaticks.

It may be, it is a harder matter than Mr. *Lob* is aware of, to determine, what is in its own nature abſolutely neceſſary to Catholick Communion; but I can tell him, *de facto*, what is, *viz.* a Complyance with the Order, Government, Diſcipline and Worſhip, as well as the Doctrine of the Catholick Church; he who will not do this, muſt ſeparate from the Catholick Church, and try it at the laſt day, who was in the right; I am content, that Mr. *Lob*, and his beloved Separatiſts, ſhould talk on of

401

Wt is absolutely necessary to Catholick Communion. 392, 392

vid. Sherlock's Vind. of Some Protestant Principles 4to. p. 46, &c.

of unſcriptural Terms of Communion, ſo they will but grant, that the Church of *England* is no more guilty of impoſing unſcriptural Terms, than the Catholick Church it ſelf has always been; and that they ſeparate from the Church of *England* for ſuch Reaſons, as equally condemn the Catholick Church; and when they have the confidence to deny this, I will prove it, and ſhall deſire no better Vindication of the Church of *England*, than the Practiſe of the Catholick Church. Cap. 6.

But Mr. *Lob* obſerves, that this is *the Rule* Coſterus *the Jeſuit gives his young Scholar, If any object, where are theſe points*, viz. *of Invocation of Saints, the worſhipping of Images, the abſtaining from Fleſh, and the like, found in Scripture, and becauſe not found in Scripture, therefore to be rejected? To which, ſaith the Jeſuit, anſwer thus: Ask, where it is forbidden in Scripture? If not forbidden in Scripture, it is no ſin to obſerve them, for where there is no Law, there is no Tranſgreſſion:* But what of all this? The Rule is a very good Rule, though uſed in a bravado by the Jeſuit. Does Mr. *Lob* think, that Popery is eſtabliſhed by this Rule, as well as indifferent and *Ibid.*

Cap. 6. and uncommanded Ceremonies? Do we ſeparate from the Church of *Rome*, only for the ſake of ſome things, which are neither forbid, nor commanded in Scripture? Our Diſſenters, I ſee, have better thoughts of Popery, than the Church of *England* has, and are in a nearer capacity of reconciliation with the Church of *Rome*.

But there is one admirable Paragraph, which I cannot let paſs without ſome ſhort remarks, and it is this; *To*

Ib. p. 79. *make that a part of our Religion, which is not to be found in Scripture, is to take that for a part of our Religion, which God hath not made a part thereof, which is ſinful. How much more ſo, is the making it a Term of Communion.* Wherein there are as many abſurd Propoſitions included, as can well be in ſo few words.

426,7 1. He takes it for granted, that for the Church to require the obſervation of any thing which is not commanded in Scripture, is to make a part of Religion of it; and yet the Church may and does enjoyn ſuch things, not as parts of Religion, but as Rules of Order and Diſcipline. Who then makes it a part of Religion? If it be made a part

of

of Religion, it muſt be made ſo by God, or the Church; he acknowledges, God does not make it a part of Religion, and the Church declares ſhe does not, how then does it come to be a part of Religion? Or does the Church make a part of Religion againſt her own Mind, Intention, and Declaration? Cap. 6.

In ſome caſes indeed men may do, what they never intended to do, and contract a Guilt, which they utterly diſclaim, and diſown, but then it is in ſuch caſes, where a poſitive Law, or the nature of the thing, determines the nature of the Action, whatever he, who does it, intends by it. Thus the Papiſts abhor the thoughts of Idolatry in the Worſhip of Saints, and Angels, and Images, and the conſecrated Hoſt, but are nevertheleſs guilty of Idolatry for that, becauſe the Law of God, and the Nature of the Worſhip makes it ſo. But now how can that come to be a part of Worſhip, which is not ſo, neither by a poſitive Law, nor by the Nature of the thing, nor by the Inſtitution of men? For is there any Law of God to make every thing a part of Religion, which is commanded by the Church? If there be, the Diſpute is at

an

Cap. 6. an end; we will then own these unscriptural Ceremonies as parts of Religion, and justifie our selves, by the Command of God, and the Authority of the Church. Or can the Nature of things make that a part of Religion, which is not so in its own Nature? That is, can the Nature of things make an Action to be that, which in its own Nature it is not? Or can the Institution of the Church make that a part of Religion, which the Church never instituted as a part of Religion? I would desire Mr. *Lob* and his Friends to take a little time to answer these Questions, before they talk again of the Churches making parts of Religion and humane Sacraments, against her own expres Declarations to the contrary.

2. Mr. *Lob* here supposes, that nothing must be a Term of Church Communion, but what is a necessary part of true Religion; for that is the subject of the Dispute, and to make any thing a condition of Communion, he thinks, makes it a necessary part of true Religion: And now I begin to wonder, what he means by Religion, or a part of Religion. Is Government and Discipline Religion, or a part of Religion?

gion? If they be, I would gladly know, Mr. *Lob's* definition of Religion; if they be not, are they any Terms of Communion? Or may Catholick Communion, and Church-Societies be preſerved without any Government and Diſcipline? Mr. *Lob* is mightily out, to think that nothing is neceſſary to Catholick Communion, but the profeſſion of the true Religion; Government and Diſcipline is neceſſary to preſerve any Society, and therefore obedi-
396 ence to Eccleſiaſtical Governors is a neceſſary Duty, and a neceſſary Term of Church Communion; and let a man be never ſo ſound and orthodox in Faith and Worſhip, if he be of a reſtleſs, turbulent Spirit, and diſobedient to his Governors, and their Orders and Conſtitutions, he deſerves to be flung out of Church-Communion, if he does not ſeparate himſelf, and will be damned for it too without Repentance. Though a very little thing may make a Schiſm, yet a Schiſm is a great and damning ſin, and the leſs the Cauſe is, the greater is the Sin. For the guilt of Schiſm and Diſobedience is not eſtimated from the intrinſick value of the thing, in which they diſobey, and for

Cap. 6.

Obedience to Elder. Governors is a very Duty & a very Term of Church Communion.

Cap. 6. which they ſeparate, but according to the Nature of Schiſm and Diſobedience.

3. But the ſting of all is in the Tail. He ſays, *That to take that for a part of our Religion, which God hath not made a part thereof, is ſinful. How much more ſo is the making it a Term of Communion.* Which few words contain ſeveral very abſurd and contradictory Propoſitions, and the Foundation of all is ridiculouſly falſe; the Abſurdities are notorious.

1. That it is worſe to make ſuch uncommanded things, Terms of Communion than parts of Worſhip; and yet the only reaſon Mr. *Lob* and his Friends do or can aſſign why they are unlawful Terms of Communion, is, becauſe they imagine them to be made parts of Worſhip; for if they be not parts of Worſhip, what is the evil of them? Why ſhould men ſeparate for the Surplice, or Croſs in Baptiſm, *&c.*? When there is no evil in theſe things? The only evil they charge them with, being only this, that we make new Sacraments, and new parts of Worſhip by humane Authority.

2. This

2. This ſuppoſes, that that may be a part of Worſhip, which is not a Term of Communion. Otherwiſe it can be neither better nor worſe to make any thing a part of Worſhip, and a term of Communion. But this is a new Notion, which I believe mankind was not inſtructed in before, to make that no term of Communion, which we make a part of Worſhip; which ſignifies to live in Chriſtian Communion together, without an obligation to communicate in all parts of Chriſtian Worſhip. Cap. 6.

3. What can be more ridiculouſly abſurd and falſe, than the Foundation of all this, that the terms of Communion are more ſacred than the Worſhip of God. That it is a leſs Crime to make a new part of Worſhip, than a new term of Communion. That the purity of the divine Worſhip is not of that Moment and Conſequence, as the conditions of Union between Chriſtians; and yet the only reaſon, why Chriſtians are to unite into one Body, is to worſhip God together? Methinks this ſhould make our new Projectors careful what they do, and make Mr. *H.* ſeriouſly reflect, upon what he has done, who has propoſed ſuch new materials

Cap. 6. for Union, as were never known in the Chriſtian Church before.

Reply, p. 80. 11. His next Argument to vindicate themſelves from Schiſm, is made up, as he ſays, of Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s own Rule compared with his Subſtitutes notion, but the Application and Concluſion, which is the only thing conſiderable, is his own. Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Rule is, that *Separation is lawful, in caſe men make things indifferent neceſſary to Salvation, and divide the Church upon that account.* But *the Church of* England *according to my notion, makes indifferent things neceſſary to Salvation.* Ergo, *we may, yea, we muſt ſeparate, or 'tis our duty, and therefore not our ſin to ſeparate,* (i.e.) *we are no Schiſmaticks.* Wonderful ſubtil! The Dean's Rule I own, and will ſtand to, that if men make indifferent things neceſſary to Salvation, *and divide the Church upon that account*, we may lawfully ſeparate from them; where the Dean makes two things neceſſary to juſtifie a Separation. 1. That they make indifferent things neceſſary to Salvation, that is, that they aſſert the very doing of ſuch a thing to be neceſſary to Salvation, as the falſe Apoſtles aſſerted Circumciſion

was.

was. But yet 2. This of it ſelf is not ſufficient to juſtifie a Separation, unleſs theſe men *divide the Church upon this account.* This Mr. *Lob* thought fit to leave out of his Argument, becauſe it would have ſpoiled his Argument to have put it in. The bare aſſerting indifferent things to be neceſſary to Salvation, if they do not divide the Church upon it, will not juſtifie a Separation. This many believing Jews did. They thought Circumciſion and the Obſervation of the Law of *Moſes* neceſſary to Salvation, and yet St. *Paul* commands Jews and Gentiles to receive each other, and to maintain one Communion; and St. *Paul* himſelf complyed ſometimes with them to avoid any ſcandal. But when ſome falſe Apoſtles did not only aſſert the neceſſity of ſuch things to Salvation, but would impoſe this upon all Chriſtians, or break Communion with them; when they ſeparated from the Church, it was very lawful to ſeparate from them. And therefore we muſt correct Mr. *Lob*'s Major Propoſition thus. Cap. 6.

Cap. 6. *From such as make indifferent things necessary to Salvation, and divide the Church upon that account, we must separate. This is Dr.* Stillingfleets.

Let us now consider his Minor Proposition, which, he says, is mine.

But the Church of England *makes indifferent things necessary to Salvation. This is the Dr's. Substitutes notion.*

God forbid! My notion, I never had such a thought in my life. Well! But if Mr. *Lob* can prove this against me, I know no help for it, I'le make my Defence, as well as I can. But let us hear what he says.

He attempts two or three ways to prove this, but blunders in each; the
Ibid. first way is this. *That which is necessary to our Communion with the Catholick Church, is according to his Doctrine, necessary to Salvation.* Now this I deny. Communion with the Catholick Church is necessary to Salvation, but whatever may be necessary to our Communion with the Catholick Church, is not therefore in its own nature necessary to Salvation. It may be necessary in order to Catholick Communion, to comply with many inconvenient, though not sinful terms of Communion, and all wise

wiſe and good men have thought themſelves bound to do ſo, when there is no other Remedy, does it hence follow then, that theſe good men account theſe inconvenient things neceſſary to Salvation? But to proceed, *But indifferent things* (ſays Mr. *Lob*) *are neceſſary to our Communion with the Church of* England, *which is one with the Communion with the Catholick Church, in that, according to him, they are made neceſſary to our Communion with the Church of* England, *which is one with the Communion with the Catholick Church, according to his conſtant judgment.* Ergo, I confeſs, what he means by this, I cannot well underſtand; I ſuppoſe, it may be this. That I make Communion with the Catholick Church, and conſequently with the Church of *England*, as a ſound and orthodox part of the Catholick Church to be neceſſary to Salvation. But the obſervation of ſome indifferent things is *de facto*, neceſſary to the Communion of the Church of *England*, becauſe the Church enjoyns the Obſervation of ſome indifferent things. *Ergo*, indifferent things are made neceſſary to Salvation. Cap. 6.

Cap. 6. Now, 1. I would only ask Mr. *Lob* in his ear, whether his own Conſcience don't tell him, that he has prevaricated here; whether he has not uſed that term, *Neceſſary to Salvation*, in different ſenſes, on purpoſe to abuſe the Dean and his Subſtitute together, and to impoſe upon his ignorant Proſelytes. By *making indifferent things neceſſary to Salvation*, the Dean plainly meant, that they taught, that thoſe things, which were indeed indifferent, though not acknowledged ſo by them, had ſuch a natural and moral, or inſtituted vertue and efficacy to our Salvation, that without obſerving of them, no man can be ſaved; that they are neceſſary to Salvation, as any other neceſſary and eſſential part or duty of Religion is, the neglect of which, meerly upon account of ſuch a neglect will damn us. Now does the Dean, does his Subſtitute, does the Church of *England*, teach indifferent things to be neceſſary in this ſence, to have an immediate and direct influence upon our Salvation? Can any man in his wits, who owns theſe things to be indifferent, in the ſame breath aſſert them to be neceſſary in this ſenſe? And therefore Mr. *Lob*'s Argument is a ridiculous

culous Sophiſm, or as Mr. *H.* ſpeaks, has four terms in it. For neceſſary to Salvation in the Major Propoſition, ſignifies very differently from neceſſary to Salvation in the Minor Propoſition; and thus the Dean and his Subſtitute are reconciled. Cap. 6.

But, 2. How ſhall I bring my ſelf off; for though I do not aſſert a direct neceſſity of indifferent things to Salvation, yet I bring in a neceſſity at a back Door, and neceſſity is neceſſity, and if it be a damning neceſſity, it is no matter of what kind and nature the neceſſity be. I make Communion with the Church of *England* neceſſary to Salvation, and indifferent obſervances are neceſſary to the Communion of the Church of *England*, and therefore are themſelves neceſſary to Salvation. But yet I doubt not to make it appear, that though the Church of *England* does require the obſervance of ſuch indifferent things from all in her Communion, yet ſhe makes theſe things in no ſenſe neceſſary to Salvation. For,

1. In many caſes ſhe does not charge the bare not obſerving ſuch indifferent Rites with any guilt, and therefore is far enough from making them neceſſary

to

Cap. 6. to Salvation. Such indifferent things are not enjoyned for their own sake, but for the sake of publick Order and Decency; and therefore when they can be neglected without publick Scandal and Offence, without a contempt of the Government, without the guilt of Schism and Separation, it is no fault, nor accounted such by the Church. And yet did she enjoyn these things as necessary to Salvation, they would equally oblige in all times, and in all cases without exception.

2. Though Schism be a damning sin, yet the imposition of such indifferent things is no necessary cause of a Schismatical Separation. Men may communicate in all or in most parts of Christian Worship with the Church of *England*, without assenting to such unscriptural Impositions, or yielding any active obedience to them, and I suppose, Mr. *Lob* will confess, that there is a very material difference between an active and passive Obedience in doubtful cases. The terms of Lay-Communion are as easie, as ever they were in any setled and constituted Church; as for publick Forms of Prayer, I must except them out of the number of indifferent things,

The Terms of Lay-Communion in y Ch. of Engl. easy.

things, for they have at leaſt equal Authority, and are infinitely more expedient, not to ſay neceſſary for publick Worſhip, than their *ex tempore* Prayers. And then what is there required of a private Chriſtian to do, to qualifie him for Church-Communion; if he does not like the Surplice, he does not wear it himſelf, and let the Miniſter look to that. What hurt is it to Parents or their Children, to ſubmit to the Authority of the Church, in uſing the ſign of the Croſs in Baptiſm? They only offer their Children to be baptized; if the Miniſter does ſomething more, than what they think neceſſary and expedient, let the Church look to that, which enjoyns it: Private Chriſtians, who have not Authority to alter publick Conſtitutions, are not concerned in that: So that there is but one Ceremony, wherein they are required to be active, and that is, receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper kneeling, which men thus peaceably diſpoſed, may eaſily be ſatisfied in the lawfulneſs and fitneſs of, and till they can be ſatisfied, may more innocently abſtain from the Lord's Table, and joyn in all other parts of Chriſtian Worſhip, than they

Cap. 6.

Surplice

Croſs in Bapt.

Kneeling at the Sacrament

Cap. 6. they can ſeparate from the Church: So that theſe indifferent things can be no juſt cauſe for any private Chriſtians to ſeparate, and if notwithſtanding they do ſeparate, and are damned for it, they muſt not charge theſe innocent Ceremonies with their Damnation. And as for thoſe, who cannot conform as Miniſters, they may, and moſt of them own they can, conform as Lay-men, and therefore theſe Ceremonies are no cauſe of their Separation.

3. Suppoſe men do take occaſion from the Diſputes and Quarrels about indifferent things, to ſeparate from the Church, and be damned for it, yet they are not damned for not obſerving ſuch indifferent Cuſtoms, though that may be the remote occaſion of it; but for their pride and ſelf-conceit, for their diſobedience to their Superiors, for their dividing the unity of the Church, and diſturbing the peace of it. Suppoſe two men ſhould be ſo well employed, as to play at puſh-pin, and ſhould quarrel and fight, and one ſhould be killed, and the other hanged, would you ſay this man was hanged for playing at puſh-pin? Thus it is here, it is not the occaſion which peeviſh men tak-

111, 118, 373, 401

take to divide the Church, which muſt be charged with their Damnation, but their Pride, their Faction, their Obſtinacy, their Diſobedience and ungovernable temper of mind, which takes ſuch ſmall occaſions to divide, and diſturb the Church. If Mr. *Lob* does not think this enough in anſwer to his Argument, I think, he is a little unreaſonable. Cap. 6. 384, 390.

III. Our Author has another device ſtill to prove from my own Conceſſions, that Diſſenters are not Schiſmaticks. He ſays, that Dr. *Gunning*, and Dr. *Pearſon*, (now two learned and reverend Prelates, whoſe bare Authority, I confeſs, is more conſiderable to me, than all our Author's Arguments) *in a Conference with the Papiſts, aſſert, That a Superiors unjuſt caſting out of the Church, is Schiſmatical.* And this I heartily aſſent to. *But according to my notion, the Church of* England *is guilty of ſuch impoſitions, and does unjuſtly excommunicate Diſſenters.* This I utterly deny. But let us hear, how Mr. *Lob* proves it. Reply, p. 82.

1. He ſays, *That the Impoſitions are ſinful, is evident, in that indifferent things (as has been proved) are made neceſſary to Salvation.* But I preſume the Reader

Cap. 6. der will ſee, that this has not been proved yet, and therefore it is not evident. I will only ask our Author, whether theſe reverend Biſhops by unjuſt Excommunications, mean excommunicating thoſe, who refuſe to ſubmit to the juſt Authority of their Superiors in indifferent things. If they don't, as it is evident they don't, he only abuſes them, and his Readers, by their Authority.

2. *That the Church of* England *excommunicates unjuſtly*, he ſays, *is very demonſtrable, even in that the Church doth, as I would have it, by Excommunication, caſt thouſands out of the ſtate of Salvation, for not complying with little uncommanded things*: But now here are two great miſtakes. For, 1. The Church caſts no man out of a ſtate of Salvation, but caſts them out of her own Communion; that this excludes them from a ſtate of Salvation, is not the Act of the Church, but God's Act. The Church does not deſire, nor deſign the Damnation of any man, but excommunicates them for their correction and amendment, that God would give them repentance unto life: And there may be very juſt Reaſons for the Church to excommunicate, when God, who

who knows every circumſtance of things more particularly, than Church-Governors can, may continue thoſe in the Communion of the inviſible Church, who are caſt out of viſible Communion. Wilful Schiſm is in all caſes a damning Schiſm, Excommunication is no ſin at all, but a ſevere puniſhment, when it is deſerved, and contracts the guilt of Schiſm, when it is deſpiſed. He who is unjuſtly caſt out of the Church, ought not to deſpiſe ſuch Cenſures, but to uſe all juſt and lawful means to be reſtored again to Communion. But the Excommunication of the Church, and the wilful Separation of Schiſmaticks, are two as different things, as can well be imagined. I never aſſerted, that Church-Cenſures and Excommunications always put men out of a ſtate of Salvation, but I aſſert, that wilful Schiſm does. Cap. 6.

2. Nor does the Church excommunicate meerly for the ſake of *ſome little uncommanded things*, but for Schiſm and Church-factions, and diſobedience to Government, which are inconſiſtent with the order and preſervation of any Society, and are not the leſs ſins, becauſe the Diſpute and Quarrel is about ſome little things. To excommunicate any

They are juſtly excom. who refuſe Obed. to the juſt Authority of their Sup.r in indif. things

Cap. 6. any man becauſe he will not yield to ſinful terms of Communion, *i. e.* becauſe he will not break the expreſs Laws of God, to comply with the Laws of the Church, is an unjuſt and Schiſmatical Excommunication; but it is neceſſary to the good Order and Government of any Society to Excommunicate thoſe, who will not own the juſt Authority of the Church, be the thing never ſo little for which they ſeparate.

For we muſt conſider, that a Church muſt firſt be Schiſmatical her ſelf, before ſhe can excommunicate Schiſmatically. Any Church, which either forbids the doing what God has commanded, or commands, what God hath forbid, is ſo far a Schiſmatick from the Catholick Church, whoſe Communion muſt be regulated by the divine Laws; and if ſhe excommunicates any ſingle Perſons, or Churches, for not complying with theſe unlawful and Schiſmatical terms of Communion, her Excommunications are Schiſmatical, becauſe her terms of Communion are ſo, which is the caſe of the Church of *Rome*. But it is impoſſible, that a Church, which is not Schiſmatical, can excommunicate Schiſmatically.

A

A man, who is unjuſtly excommunicated, is caſt out of the external Communion of the Church, but does not ſchiſmatically ſeparate himſelf. Nay, though he be upon other accounts unjuſtly excommunicated, if there be nothing unlawful in the Communion of that Church, (which is the unjuſt Excommunication, which theſe learned Biſhops aſſert to be ſchiſmatical) or he be not excommunicated upon any ſuch account, he muſt patiently bear it, and uſe all means to be reſtored, but muſt not ſet up a diſtinct and oppoſite Communion, which would be a cauſeleſs Schiſm. For meer Excommunication, though in ſome reſpects never ſo unjuſt, is not a ſufficient reaſon to juſtifie a formed Schiſm and Separation from any Church, no more than any acts of injuſtice, which private men ſuffer, will juſtifie a Rebellion againſt their Prince; God is the Judge and the Protector of oppreſſed Vertue and Innocence, whether it ſuffer from Church or State, and there only lies our laſt Appeal. So that meer Excommunication can never make any Church ſchiſmatical, or though it may occaſion, yet it can never juſtifie a Schiſm. Cap. 6.

Cap. 6. But now when any Church by enjoyning ſinful terms of Communion, ſeparates ſo far from the Catholick Church, and excommunicates all Perſons and Churches, who will not communicate with her in ſuch unlawful things, it is lawful and juſtifiable, nay neceſſary for ſuch Perſons to preſerve the purity of their own Communion, or to form themſelves into a diſtinct Communion in the Unity of the Catholick Church, and to leave ſuch a Church to ſtand by her ſelf: Here now is a formed Schiſm between theſe Churches, and the Queſtion is, who is the Schiſmatick, the excommunicating or the excommunicated Churches. And the anſwer is very plain, the excommunicating Church is the Schiſmatick, becauſe ſhe has departed from Catholick Communion, by impoſing unlawful terms of Communion.

So that Excommunication can never be Schiſmatical, but when the terms of Communion are a Schiſm from the Catholick Church; and therefore the whole of the Diſpute comes to this, whether the enjoyning the obſervance of ſome indifferent and uncommanded Ceremonies be a Schiſm from the Catholick Church,

Church; and when Mr. *Lob* can prove this, I will readily grant the Church of *England* to be ſchiſmatical, whether ſhe excommunicate Diſſenters or not. But this will be a hard matter for him to do, when the Catholick Church has always aſſerted the Authority of the Church in theſe matters, and has always practiſed a great many uncommanded Ceremonies in all Ages; but this I have diſcourſed ſufficiently above. Cap. 6.

Thus we ſee, how Mr. *Lob* fails in his new attempts, to prove the Church of *England* the Schiſmatick from my own Principles and Conceſſions. Let us now conſider, how he juſtifies his old Argument to prove the Church the divider; and certainly never any man was more hard put to it, to make ſome little inſignificant appearance of an Anſwer, than he was, and yet he puts a very good face on it, and with a brave Confidence, huffs it off, as if there were nothing ſaid that deſerved an Anſwer. And I confeſs, it abundantly ſatisfies me, what a vain attempt it is, to convince men, who are reſolved, not to be convinc'd.

Cap. 6. If Mr. *Lob*, or any other for him will give a fair and particular Anſwer to thoſe few Pages in the Defence, from p. 22. to p. 53. I promiſe them to be their Convert, and a zealous oppoſer of all indifferent Ceremonies in Religion. But becauſe Mr. *Lob* would have the World believe, that he has done this already, I ſhall deſire my Readers to look over thoſe few Pages in the Defence, and compare them with his Reply; and if this could be obtained, I would venture to leave it, juſt as it is without any further remarks. But leaſt he ſhould boaſt, that I decline the Diſpute, I ſhall briefly conſider, what deſpicable Arts he uſes to impoſe upon his Readers.

Mr. *Lob* undertook to prove the Church, not the Diſſenter, to be the divider by this Argument. *The Church without ſin can part with their indifferent Ceremonies, but Diſſenters without ſin cannot comply with them; what then muſt be done for Union? Muſt the Epiſcopal comply in things, wherein they can without ſin? Or muſt the Diſſenters ſin and looſe their Peace with God for Union?* And a little after, he adds; *This is the ſtate of the Caſe, the Diſſenters would unite,*

unite, but cannot, the Epiſcopals can, but will not. The cannot of the Diſſenters, and the Epiſcopals will not, doth make the diviſion; but who is the faulty Divider? If the true reaſon of our diviſion lay on the Diſſenters will not, when they can, 'twould be eaſie to conclude them obſtinate and perverſe (that is, in plain *Engliſh*, Schiſmaticks) [redacted] *not to do, what they can for Peace? But ſince they would, but cannot without ſin, how can they be the Dividers?* Cap. 6.

This I ſhewed particularly, was *all trick and fallacy. When he ſays, the Church without ſin can part with their indifferent Ceremonies; if by the Church he means any thing leſs than the King and Parliament, it is falſe. For all the Biſhops and Clergy in* England *cannot without ſin part with theſe indifferent Ceremonies, till the Law enacting them be repealed. And if by indifferent Ceremonies he means Dioceſan Epiſcopacy and Liturgies, as it is plain he does, the Church of* England *does not account theſe indifferent Ceremonies, nor think, ſhe can part with them without ſin. And when he ſays, that the Diſſenters without ſin cannot comply with them; if by without ſin he means without breaking ſome divine* Defence, p. 27. &c.

Cap. 6. *Law, it is falſe; for there is no Law to forbid our obedience to Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Governors in indifferent things: If he means, that they muſt act contrary to their Conſcience, that is, their own Opinion and Judgment of things, they may be the Dividers and Schiſmaticks for all that; unleſs we will ſay, that no man, but a profligate Knave, who ſins againſt his Conſcience, can be a Schiſmatick.*

Thus as *for his will not and cannot. If by the Epiſcopals will not, he means, that they will not do, what they may by divine and humane Laws, and with a juſt reſpect to the good Order and Government and Edification of the Church, and regular Adminiſtration of holy Offices, they are faulty in it, but may be no Schiſmaticks notwithſtanding, ſo long as they exact no ſinful terms of Communion: and if by the Diſſenters cannot, he means their private Opinions and Perſwaſions, which hinder their Complyance, they may be the Dividers ſtill, if their perſwaſions be erroneous.*

All this and a great deal more our Author paſſes over very wiſely without the leaſt notice; but to convince him of the Sophiſtry of this Argument, I pro-

propoſed another like it, which as fairly caſt the Schiſm upon the Diſſenter, as his did upon the Church; and it was this: *If the Diſſenters can without ſin obey their Governors in indifferent, that is, in lawful things, but will not; and the Epiſcopal would be content to part with indifferent things for Union, but cannot; who is the faulty Divider? What muſt be done for Union? Muſt the Diſſenters comply in things, wherein they can without ſin? Or muſt the Epiſcopal ſin, and loſe their Peace with God for Union?* And I added, *I would deſire our Inquirer to think better of it, and anſwer this Argument if he can, without ſhewing the Sophiſtry of his own.* Cap. 6.

Mr. *Lob* it ſeems, had enough of his own Argument, and durſt not venture his Readers with it a ſecond time; but he repeats my Argument by it ſelf, without taking notice upon what occaſion it was urged, which muſt needs make it look oddly; only wonders, why I call this an Argument, and that I ſhould ſay, that *this cannot be anſwered without a ſhewing Sophiſtry to be, where it is not.* So that it is plain, that he durſt not let his Readers know, that he had made any Argument like this, or Rep'y, p. 87.

Cap. 6. that this had any relation to his own way of reaſoning, but turns it off with, *without a ſhewing Sophiſtry, where it is not*, inſtead of let him *anſwer this Argument, if he can without ſhewing the Sophiſtry of his own.* It is apparent, Mr. *Lob* was here convinc'd, that he had reaſoned fooliſhly, but had not the honeſty and ingenuity to own it. For indeed the fallacy of both theſe Arguments conſiſts in the different acceptation of *cannot*, and *will not*; in one ſence, they may be turned againſt the Church, in another ſence againſt the Diſſenter, with equal force and truth; and therefore without a more particular explication of theſe ambiguous terms, it is a good Argument againſt neither; which muſt needs make it a very pleaſant entertainment to any man, who underſtands the Laws of reaſoning, to ſee Mr. *Lob* ſo gravely confute my Argument without taking any notice of his own; when all that I pretended was, that this was as good an Argument againſt Diſſenters, as his was againſt the Church, and were both to be anſwered the ſame way, by diſtinguiſhing the different ſignifications of thoſe terms, as I have ſhewed above.

But

But that this Inquirer might not ſay, that I had uſed ſome Art to wave the Diſpute, but had not anſwered his Argument, I granted him his own ſence of the Words, and reduced the force of his Argument to theſe two Propoſitions. 1. *That all things, which are in their own nature indifferent, may without ſin be parted with*: 2. *That the Opinion of Diſſenters, that indifferent things are unlawful in the Worſhip of God, is a juſt reaſon for parting with them.* The firſt I diſcourſed at large from this Topick, *That there can be no publick and ſolemn Worſhip, no face or appearance of any Diſcipline or Government in the Church, without the uſe of ſome ſuch indifferent things. For all actions muſt be cloathed with ſome ſuch external Circumſtances, as though they are not eſſential to the moral nature of the Action, yet are neceſſary to the external performance of it*: Which is proved at large in the Defence. All that Mr. *Lob* replies to this, is, that the force of his Argument does not lie in this, *That all things which are in their own nature indifferent, may without ſin be parted with.* How then will he prove, *that the Church without ſin may part with her indifferent Ceremonies*, if every thing, that

Cap. 6.

Defence, p. 30. &c.

Cap. 6. that is indifferent may not be parted with without ſin? I can think of no other way to prove this; if he can, I ſhall be glad to hear it. But wherein then does the force of his Argument conſiſt? Why he tells us it is this: *That no one indifferent Ceremony muſt be made ſo neceſſary a part of Religion, as to be a term of Communion.* Though I doubt, he would be troubled to apply this Propoſition dexterouſly to the proof of his Argument, yet to make as few Diſputes as may be, we will ſuppoſe the force of his Argument to lie here, and does not this come much to one? Muſt not the Church part with any indifferent Ceremony, which any Diſſenter is pleaſed to diſlike, if ſhe muſt not make any one Ceremony a Term of Communion? And if all indifferent things muſt not, cannot be parted with without ſin, then ſome indifferent things may be made the terms of Communion.

Reply, p. 85.

But here are two things Mr. *Lob* craftily or ignorantly inſinuates, which muſt not paſs without remark. 1. He will not venture his Argument meerly upon indifferent things, he has had enough of that already, but on making indifferent things neceſſary parts of Religion, whereas

whereas the Church of *England* makes them no part of Religion at all. They are not neceſſary to the moral nature of any religious Action, but to the external performance of it, as I ſhewed at large. 2. He inſinuates a proof of this, that theſe indifferent things are made neceſſary parts of Religion, becauſe they are made *terms of Communion*. Whereas the terms of Communion are of two ſorts, either the eſſentials of Faith and Worſhip, and what is in this ſence made a term of Communion, is indeed a neceſſary part of Religion; but the Church of *England* never made indifferent things terms of Communion in this notion of it, but does expreſly declare againſt it. But, 2. The external Circumſtances of Worſhip, and the Rules of Decency and Order are terms of Communion alſo, becauſe ſome ſuch external Circumſtances or Ceremonies of Worſhip, are neceſſary to the external ſolemnities and decency of Worſhip; and it is fit, that they ſhould not be left at liberty, but determined by the publick Authority of the Church, and of the State in a Chriſtian Kingdom, to which all private Chriſtians are bound to ſubmit, as I diſcourſed in the Defence. But the

Cap. 6. 390

Def. p. 30, &c. Vide [redacted] Sherlock's Anſ. to ye Protestant Reconciler p. 114.

Cap. 6. the great difficulty ſeems to lie here, that any man ſhould be denied the benefits of Chriſtian Communion, and excluded from the ordinary means of Salvation, for not complying with ſome indifferent things, which God has no where commanded, and which no Chriſtian had been bound to obſerve, had they not been commanded by the Church, which ſeems to make theſe indifferent things as neceſſary, as the moſt ſubſtantial parts of Worſhip.

Now as great as this difficulty may ſeem to be, it is but turning the Tables, and there are as great difficulties on the other ſide.

For, 1. It is as unaccountable to me, that any Chriſtian ſhould exclude himſelf from the Communion of the Chriſtian Church, and the ordinary means of Salvation, for ſuch things, as have neither any moral evil in them, nor are forbid by any poſitive Law of God, which makes the not doing ſuch things to be more neceſſary than the Communion of the Church, or the Worſhip of God it ſelf. Now, 1. Is not every man as accountable to God for his own Soul, as the Church is? 2. Has any man any more warrant for excluding himſelf

ſelf from Chriſtian Communion, for not doing what God has not forbid, than the Church has for caſting them out of Communion, for not obſerving ſome innocent Rites and Uſages, though not commanded by God? For, 3. Is it not a greater encroachment on the divine Power and Prerogative to make that unlawful, which God has not forbid, than it is to enjoyn the obſervance of that, which God has not commanded? The firſt alters the nature of things, makes that ſinful, which God has not made ſinful. The ſecond only determins the circumſtances of Action, which God had not determined, but left to the Determination of humane Prudence, or Eccleſiaſtical Authority. And, 4. Which is likely to be the beſt juſtification, the Opinion of a private man in oppoſition to the Authority, and to the diſturbance of the Peace and Communion of the Church, or the publick Judgment and Authority of the Church in preſerving her own Diſcipline and Government, and cenſuring obſtinate and diſorderly Members. Let Mr. *Lob* conſider, how to juſtifie themſelves in making that unlawful, which God has not forbid, and ſeparating from the

Cap. 6.

Cap. 6. the Communion of the Church for that reaſon, and I will more eaſily juſtifie the Church in denying Communion to thoſe, who refuſe to comply with innocent, but uncommanded Rites.

But, 2. This Difficulty is the ſame in all Communions, as well as in the Communion of the Church of *England*. Neither *Presbyterians*, nor *Independents*, will allow diſorderly Members in their Communion, who will not ſubmit to the Conſtitutions of their ſeveral Churches; and thereby they make the Peculiarities of their Churches neceſſary terms of their Communion. They will no more ſuffer a man to receive the Sacrament kneeling, nor to pray in a Surplice, nor to baptize with the ſign of the Croſs in their Churches, than the Church of *England* will ſuffer her Members to neglect theſe Ceremonies; and therefore they make the not doing ſuch indifferent things as neceſſary terms of Communion, as the Church of *England* does the doing of them, and do as ſtrictly enjoyn Conformity to their own way and modes of Worſhip, as the Church of *England* does to hers, and therefore the Church may as eaſily defend her ſelf from this difficulty, as the Conventicles can.

The Diſſenters as ſtrictly enjoyn Conformity to their Modes of Worſhip, as ye Ch. of Engl. does to hers.

But

But the bare retorting of a difficulty does not anſwer it, though ſuch men ought in modeſty to be ſilent, till they can anſwer for themſelves, and then they will be aſhamed to urge this Argument againſt the Church: And it is a ſign, ſuch men think but of one ſide, who uſe ſuch Arguments againſt their Adverſaries, as recoil upon themſelves. But indeed the Difficulty it ſelf, when it is fairly ſtated is no difficulty, as will appear in theſe following Propoſitions, ſome of which are already proved in the Defence; and therefore to ſave my ſelf the trouble of tranſcribing, I ſhall only direct my Reader, where to find them proved. Cap. 6.

The Difficulty is, why thoſe things, which are acknowledged to be indifferent, ſhould be ſo ſtrictly enjoyned, as to exclude thoſe from Chriſtian Communion, who will not, or cannot comply with them. Now to this I anſwer by theſe ſteps.

1. That ſome things, which are indifferent in their own nature, are yet neceſſary ſolemnities of Worſhip, without which the publick Worſhip of God cannot be performed at all, or can have no face or appearance of Worſhip, Defence, p. 30. &c.

Cap. 6. ſhip, as I have proved in the Defence.

Ib. p. 44, 45 2. The Peace, and Order, and Unity of the Church, and the due care of the divine Worſhip, requires, that the external Circumſtances of publick Worſhip ſhould be determined, and not left to the choice of every private Chriſtian.

3. Since ſome external Circumſtances and Solemnities of Worſhip muſt be determined, and yet are not determined by any poſitive Law of God, it is plain, that they are left to the determination of the publick Authority of the Church, which muſt determine all private Chriſtians. For every thing of a publick nature, wherein a whole Society is concerned, muſt be determined and overruled by publick Authority, or no Society can ſubſiſt. Every private Chriſtian in his private Capacity may chooſe for himſelf; every Maſter of a Family may and ought to chooſe for his Family, as far as concerns the Government of it; and the ſupreme Authority of every Society muſt chooſe for the Society. For how is it poſſible, there ſhould be any decency or uniformity of Worſhip, any Order or Government maintained

tained in the Church, if it is in the Power of every private Christian to make the most wholsom Constitutions of a Church, unlawful and sinful Impositions by his private dissent, and obstinate refusal of Obedience. Cap. 6.

4. If it be lawful for the publick Authority of the Church, to determine the indifferent Circumstances, and external Solemnities of Worship, it is necessary to make them the terms of Communion; that is, it can't be avoided, but it must be so. For when the Church determines the indifferent and undetermined Circumstances of Worship, all that is meant by it, is, that she requires all in her Communion to worship God in such a manner, which is the only sence, wherein indifferent things are, or can be made the terms of Communion. So that the Controversie must return, where it first began, about the lawfulness of indifferent Circumstances, and Ceremonies of Worship, and the Power of the Church to determine them; for making them terms of Communion is no new difficulty, for it signifies no more than prescribing such a way of worshipping God; and if it be lawful for the Church to prescribe the Modes

Cap. 6. and Circumſtances of Worſhip, ſhe cannot miſtake in making them terms of Communion.

For, 5. If the Church have Authority to preſcribe the Order and Circumſtances of publick Worſhip, it is unreaſonable to think, that ſhe may not juſtly deny thoſe her Communion, who will not ſubmit to her Authority, and comply with her Orders and Conſtitutions; Which is to ſay, that ſhe has Authority, and that ſhe has none. For it is ſufficiently known, that the Church, as ſuch, has no other Authority, but to receive in, or to ſhut out of her Communion; and if ſhe cannot aſſiſt her commanding Authority, with her Authority of Cenſures, it is little worth.

Nay, 6. In the nature of the thing it cannot be otherwiſe. Thoſe, who will not conform to the Conſtitutions of the Church, muſt forſake her Aſſemblies, for there is no other way of Worſhip to be had there. And therefore we need enquire no further, than whether it be lawful for the Church to preſcribe a form of Worſhip to her ſelf; if it be, ſhe needs exerciſe no other Authority; for thoſe, who will not conform

to

to it, will ſeparate themſelves without her Authority. And as for the ſin and danger of Schiſm, let the Church look to her ſelf, that ſhe give no juſt occaſion for it, and let ſcrupulous and tender Conſciences look to themſelves, that they take no unjuſt Offence; and this is the only remedy I know of in this caſe, without proſtituting Church-Authority, and the Worſhip of God, to a blind and factious Zeal. And yet I ſuppoſe, no Church is bound to own thoſe of her Communion, who ſeparate from her Worſhip, and deſpiſe her Authority. Cap. 6.

7. And whereas Mr. *Lob* founds his Objection upon making *indifferent things* terms of Communion, every one, who underſtands the nature of Government, knows, that it is an unſufferable miſchief, to diſturb and diſſolve humane Societies, though for very little things. Schiſm is a very great evil; and nevertheleſs becauſe the Diſpute is about indifferent things, the preſervation of the Peace and Unity of the Church, the decency and ſolemnities of Worſhip, and the ſacredneſs of Authority, is neceſſary to Chriſtian Communion, without which the Church muſt diſſolve and

Cap. 6. disband into private Conventicles, as we ſee at this day; and therefore whoever diſturbs Chriſtian Communion for indifferent things, does as well deſerve to be caſt out of the Church, as the moſt profligate ſinners. But to return to Mr. *Lob*.

The only Objection he has againſt all that I urged in the Defence, is, that I run from Circumſtances to Ceremonies, and yet his Conſcience tells him, if ever he read the Defence, that he knows the contrary; for I particularly anſwered that Objection in the Defence, and it ſeems, I have ſo anſwered it, that Mr. *Lob* thought it the wiſer courſe to diſſemble his knowledg of any ſuch Anſwer, than to attempt any Reply to it.

Defence, p. 38.

And now let any man judge, what an unreaſonable task Mr. *Lob* has put on me. *It lies on him* (ſays he) *either to prove to our Conviction, that we may without ſin comply with their Impoſition,* (i. e.) *he muſt ſo far effectually enlighten our Conſciences, as to help us to ſee, that the Impoſitions are not ſinful, and that we may lawfully conform.* But how is this poſſible for me, or any other man to do, when he will not ſo much as ſee, what we

Reply, p. 84.

we ſhew him? When he is ſo far from an impartial Examination of the Reaſon of what is propoſed, that he will not ſo much as own, that it was ever propoſed. It is not in our Power to give him eyes, or to make him open his eyes, when he wilfully ſhuts them. Much leſs do we deſire, as he proceeds, *That they ſhould conform againſt their Conſciences, and yield a blind obedience to ſuch Commands*; we have had too much experience of ſuch conſciencious men in the Church already, who have conformed againſt their Conſciences, that they might raiſe a Church of *England*-Rebellion, as this Author impudently ſuggeſts, and takes the firſt opportunity to pull down the Church, and to expiate their ſins of Conformity by a thorough Reformation. There is ſomething lies on them to do, as well as on us; and that is freely and impartially to conſider, what is offered for their Conviction; to acknowledg themſelves convinc'd, when they are convinc'd; to prefer the Salvation of their own Souls, and the Peace of the Church, before private Fame, or ſerving a Party; that is, in a word, to be honeſt, and then there will be no need for the Church to part with her Impoſitions. Cap. 6.

Cap. 6.

II. The ſecond thing wherein I obſerved the force of his Argument lay, was this: *That the Opinion of the Diſſenters, that indifferent things are unlawful in the Worſhip of God, is a juſt and neceſſary Reaſon for parting with them.* Now he does not take notice of any one word of Anſwer I return to this, nay, does not ſo much, as repreſent the Reaſon, why I place the force of his Argument in this, which is, that *if the Opinion of Diſſenters, that all indifferent things are unlawful, be not a ſufficient Reaſon for parting with them, then there may be no fault in the Epiſcopals* will not, *or a ſufficient juſtification or excuſe in the Diſſenters* cannot. Inſtead of which, he ſays, I give this Reaſon for it; *if it be not lawful to part with every thing that is indifferent, thoſe who retain the uſe of* (*ſome*, which he leaves out) *indifferent things, cannot meerly upon that account, be called Dividers or Schiſmaticks*, which does not refer to the ſecond, but to the firſt thing, wherein I placed the force of his Argument. *That all things, which are in their own nature indifferent, may without ſin be parted with.* Certainly never any man was in a greater turmoil and confuſion of thoughts, than

Reply, p. 85.

than Mr. *Lob* appears to have been in all this time, when he was reſolved to anſwer, but knew not what to ſay. No man, I fear, need convince Mr. *Lob*, that he may conform againſt his Conſcience. Make it but his Intereſt to conform, and his Conſcience ſeems ready prepar'd. Cap. 6.

Well, but however, that he might ſeem to return ſome Anſwer to my Confutation of that Principle, that *the Opinion of Diſſenters, that indifferent things are unlawful in the Worſhip of God, is a juſt and neceſſary Reaſon for the Church to part with them*; he juſt names it, and then picks ſome Quarrels with what I had ſaid upon the firſt thing, *that all indifferent things cannot be parted with, without ſin*, and this muſt paſs for an Anſwer to the ſecond. And how is it poſſible *to enlighten* ſuch a man as this?

But let us hear, what he ſays. *You ſhould remember, that I diſtinguiſhed between Ceremonies and Circumſtances, between what is a part of Religion, and intrinſecal thereunto, and what is extrinſecal only. But you run to external Circumſtances that are neceſſary in theſe; which is off from the point in hand.* Had

Can. 6. I done ſo, I believe Mr. *Lob* would not have been ſo ſparing of Paper, as not to have ſhewn his Readers, how I did it. But I have already anſwered that Suggeſtion, and directed my Readers, where they may find the contrary, if they dare believe their own eyes.

Ib. p. 85. But he ſays, *I run from what is indifferent, to what is neceſſary, as if we call'd you to part with any neceſſary thing.* This is another trick. The caſe is this: He charges the Church of *England* with being the Divider, becauſe ſhe does not part with indifferent things, which ſhe may part with without ſin. I prove, that though no particular indifferent Ceremony can be ſaid to be neceſſary, for then it were no longer indifferent, yet ſome indifferent things are neceſſary to publick Worſhip, not to the moral Nature, but the external performance of Religious Actions, and therefore all indifferent things cannot be parted with without deſtroying publick Worſhip; and yet if we muſt part with indifferent things, meerly conſidered as indifferent, by the ſame Reaſon we muſt be obliged to part with all. This he calls running from what is indifferent, to what is neceſſary; whereas it only proves,

proves, that ſome things, which are in- Cap. 6.
different in their own Natures, are neceſſary to publick Worſhip, which was very much to my purpoſe, though not to his.

I gave an Inſtance of this in ſome Actions, which cannot poſſibly be ſtript from all external Circumſtances. As *a man, who is to travel from* London *to* York, *is not bound either to go thither on Foot, or to ride on Horſe-back, or in a Coach, each of theſe ways are in themſelves indifferent; but yet if he will travel to* York, *he muſt uſe one or other of theſe ways of Motion, not any one in particular is neceſſary, but yet ſome or other is.* But ſays Mr. *Lob*, *One has not ſtrength to walk, another cannot bear riding in a Coach, yet to* York *they muſt go. If you will keep to your point, you muſt ſay to him, that can't walk, ſome way of Motion is neceſſary to your going to* York, *if you'l go thither, therefore you ſhall walk, or not go thither.* The force of which Anſwer amounts to this, that every man muſt be left at liberty to chooſe the external Circumſtances of Worſhip for himſelf, as he is to chooſe his own way of Travelling, whether on Foot, or by Horſe, or Coach. But this alſo, I had

Def. p. 30.

Ib. p. 86.

par-

Cap. 7. particularly conſidered, and anſwered in the Defence, though our Inquirer is pleaſed to take no notice of it, and I ſuppoſe, ſhould I repeat what I have ſaid, he will take as little notice of it the ſecond time, as he has done the firſt. The Inquiſitive Reader may find directions in the Margin, where to ſeek for an Anſwer to it. And if Mr. *Lob* cannot think of ſome better Defence, he and his beloved Diſſenters muſt be the Dividers and the Schiſmaticks ſtill.

Defence, p. 44.

CHAP. VII.

Mr. Humphrey's *Materials for Union, examined.*

THE laſt thing I propoſed to my ſelf for the Concluſion of this Work, was to examine Mr. *Lob*'s Preface, and Mr. *H*'s Materials for Union: But this Vindication is already much larger, than I intended it, and I find this Work done very ſufficiently by Mr. *Long*, in a late Treatiſe, Entitled, *No Proteſtant, but the Diſſenters Plot*; and therefore though it were eaſie to enlarge upon this Subject, I ſhall make but ſome

1682

brief Remarks upon the Materials for Union, and refer those who are inquisitive, for further satisfaction to the forementioned Treatise. And I shall only observe these four things in Mr. *H's.* project: 1. That it destroys the present Constitution of the Church of *England.* 2. That it sets up no National Church in the room of it. 3. That it cures no Schism. 4. That it is not a likely way so much as to preserve external Peace and Union in the Nation. Cap. 7.

1. These Materials for Union destroy the present Constitution of the Church of *England*; and is not this a modest Proposal in a Dissenter, to pull down the Church of *England*, which is established by Law, and is owned by the greatest and most considerable part of the Nation, to make way for Union? Does Mr. *H.* imagine, that the true Sons of the Church, will so easily part with so ancient and Apostolical a Government, which owes not its Institution to Civil Powers? And what would the Civil State get by this, to exchange the Church for Dissenters? To make an Imaginary National Church by a Combination of Dissenters, and to part with a much better Church for it? To attempt a Union

on between Diſſenters, who, as Mr. *H.* owns, can never agree their Diſputes, and therefore can never unite, though they may be tied together, or comprehended in the ſame Veſſel, as Sand or Water is, and to diſſolve a Church, which is all of a piece, firmly united within it ſelf, and to its Prince?

But what need all this? Will Mr. *H.* ſay, I never deſigned to diſſolve the Conſtitution of the Church of *England*, but only to bring Diſſenters into the legal Eſtabliſhment. Let this then be tried, whether his Materials for Union do not deſtroy the preſent Conſtitution, Root and Branch.

The preſent Conſtitution of our Church, in Conformity to the Ancient Apoſtolical Government, conſiſts of Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons; let us try then, whether we can find either of theſe in Mr. *H.*'s Materials for Union.

As for Deacons, he has not one word of them, though Mr. *Lob.* acknowledges, they were owned for an Eccleſiaſtical Order by the neceſſary Erudition; but a great Oracle thinks, this Order may be ſpared, though it has been continued in the Church ever ſince the Apoſtles days, and therefore we will let this paſs. But

But we muſt not deny, but Mr. *H.* owns Biſhops, nay, propoſes, that ſome leading Diſſenters themſelves ſhould be made the next Biſhops; and that his Project *ſhall advance, and not leſſen the outward Power and Honour of Biſhops.* Cap. 7.

But ſtill we muſt have a care not to be cheated with a Name, inſtead of the thing. Are Mr. *H.*'s Biſhops true Apoſtolical Biſhops, as the Biſhops of the Church of *England* are? Otherwiſe he may retain the Name of Biſhops, and yet deſtroy the Epiſcopacy of the Church of *England.*

And this is the plain truth of the Caſe. Mr. *H.*'s Biſhops are not Biſhops of the Church, but *the King's Eccleſiaſtical Officers acting* circa ſacra, *only by vertue of his Authority and Commiſſion.* And therefore can exerciſe no other Authority in the Church, than the King can, which is not the Authority of a Biſhop. Mr. *Humphrey*'s Biſhops may be Lay-men, as well as Eccleſiaſticks; for though called Biſhops, they cannot do any one Act of a primitive Biſhop. They have no Eccleſiaſtical Superiority over their Clergy, but what the King has, which uſed to be diſtinguiſh'd from the Authority of the Biſhop. They have not

Cap. 7. not the Power of Ordination, nor Confirmation as the King's Biſhops, whatever they may have as Congregational Biſhops, for the King has no Power to ordain or confirm. They cannot excommunicate as Biſhops, as Mr. *H.* expreſly aſſerts, *That as the Magiſtrate does not take away or invade, but preſerve the Power of the Keys (inveſted in the Miniſter, but given with the Paſtor himſelf to the Church) no more can the Dioceſans that derive from him, aſſume it to themſelves, and deprive the particular Churches of it.*

And ſince Mr. *H.*'s Biſhops have no proper Eccleſiaſtical Authority, it is no wonder, that they have no body to govern; for theſe are all ſuch Dioceſan Biſhops, as have no Presbyters under them, every Congregational Miniſter being a Congregational Biſhop, as Mr. *H.* owns. Theſe things I diſcourſed at large in the Defence, and all that I am concerned for now, is to obſerve, how charitable Mr. *H.* is to the Church of *England* in his Materials for Union, for he leaves the Church neither Biſhops, Presbyters, nor Deacons. If they can talk at this Rate, when they cry out of Perſecution, and pretend to Petition for

Defence, p. 260. &c.

for Peace, what may we expect from them, if they ſhould be rampant once more? We ſee they are the ſame men that ever they were, when they covenanted againſt Root and Branch; and have the Impudence at this time a day, when they plead for Peace and Union, for Toleration and Comprehenſion, or other nameleſs Models, to make Propoſals for comprehending or tolerating any thing but the Church of *England*. Upon theſe terms we may be at peace, and unite with Diſſenters, if we will ſacrifice, not meerly ſome indifferent Ceremonies, (though they make a great noiſe about them, as if they were the only Impediments) but the Church of *England* it ſelf to Peace and Unity; which I hope will open mens eyes at length to ſee, what theſe men would be at, and I pray God it may be, before it be too late. Cap. 7.

2. As Mr. *H*'s Materials for Union overthrows the preſent Conſtitution of the Church of *England*, ſo it ſets up no National Church in the room of it. This is his great deſign, I confeſs, to make a National Church of all the divided and ſeparated Congregations in *England*, which he thinks may be done by the

Cap. 6. the vertue of an Act of Parliament. *I would* (ſays he) *have all our Aſſemblies that are tolerable, to be made legal by ſuch an Act, and thereby parts of the National Church, as well as the Parochial Congregations.* But though the Power of an Act of Parliament, I confeſs, is very great, yet it cannot reconcile Contradictions, nor make Diviſion to be Union, nor a great many Schiſmatical Conventicles, which divide from one another, to be one Church. For a Church is a Communion of Chriſtians, a Parochial Congregation is a Parochial Communion, a Dioceſan Church is a Dioceſan Communion, a National Church, is a National Communion, and the Catholick Church, is one Catholick Communion, as I have proved at large in the Defence, but Communion is always eſſential to the notion of a Church, of what denomination ſoever. Now ſuppoſe a Parliament ſhould by Law eſtabliſh Presbyterian, and Independent Churches of all ſorts, as well as the Church of *England*, yet how can an Act of Parliament make them all one National Communion, when after ſuch an Act, they would remain as much divided and ſeparated from one another, and from

from the Church of *England*, as they are now, and the deſign of ſuch an Act of Parliament is, to make it lawful or legal for them to continue ſo. Cap. 7.

Are the Presbyterian and Independent Congregations one Communion with themſelves, or with the Church of *England* now? If they be, why do they complain for want of Union? If they be not, will ſuch an Act of Parliament which eſtabliſhes the Schiſm, and makes it a Law, make them unite into one Communion? No man knows indeed, what may be, becauſe theſe men love to act in contradiction to Laws, and poſſibly may grow out of love with Schiſm, when it is made the Law of the Land; but if they do not, how are they more united into one Communion by ſuch a Law, than they are without it? If their Churches, Government, Diſcipline, Worſhip, be all diſtinct, and ſeparate, and contrary to each other, what a ſtrange kind of Communion is this? Every Member of the National Church, is a Member of the whole National Church; but can a Presbyterian, Independent, or Epiſcopal Church be Members of one another? By what name ſhall we call this Monſter? It is neither

Cap. 7. an Independent, Presbyterian, nor Episcopal Church, but one National Church which consists of as heterogeneous parts, as *Nebuchadnezar*'s Image, or like some monstrous Birth, with the Head of a man, the Paws of a Bear, and the Tail of a Serpent.

Desinit in piscem mulier formosa superne.

An Act of Parliament may give a legal establishment to all these divided Churches, as the Popish and Protestant Churches of *France*, are both established by the Laws of the Land; but does this make *French* Papists and Protestants to be one National Church? Mr. *H.* according to his Principles must assert them both to be but one National Church, but he will have but little thanks for it neither from Papists, nor Protestants. Not from Papists, who call the *French* Protestants Schismaticks, and therefore do not own them to be any part of their National Church; nor from the Protestants, who do as much abhor to be thought Members of the Popish Church; and yet this is such a legal National Church, as Mr. *H.* contends for, united under one Prince, who, according to his Principles, is *the accidental Head of this accidental National Church*, and yet this

this Union does not cure the Schism; for they ſtill are two diſtinct and ſeparate Churches, and are accounted Schiſmaticks to each other. Cap. 7.

There are but two or three things, ſo far as I can obſerve, whereon Mr. *H.* founds this National Union between all theſe divided and ſeparate Churches.

1. That they are all united under the King, as the *conſtitutive Regent Head of the National Church.* And this, I grant, makes them *all legal Churches*, as he ſpeaks, or *legal parts of the Church*, but it does not make them one Church. You may as well ſay, that *England*, *Scotland*, and *Ireland*, are one Kingdom, becauſe they are united under one Prince; or that all the Corporations in *England* are one National Corporation, though they have diſtinct Charters, and different Priviledges and Immunities. Nothing is National, but what extends to the whole Nation, and where ſeveral Churches are eſtabliſhed by Law, there can be no one National Church, though they be all under the Government of the ſame Prince, becauſe there is no one Church-Conſtitution, for all the Churches in the Nation to be governed by; which is the notion of a

Cap. 7. National Church in the ſenſe we now ſpeak of.

2. Another way of uniting all theſe ſeparate Churches, is by the King's Eccleſiaſtical Officers, whom he calls Biſhops, who have an equal ſuperviſing care of them all. *Their work in general being to ſuperviſe the Churches of both ſorts in their Dioceſſes, that they all walk according to their own Order, agreeable to the Goſpel, and to the Peace of one another.* Now that this cannot make them one National Church, will appear from theſe Conſiderations.

1. That theſe Biſhops, though they may be Eccleſiaſtical Perſons, yet are not properly Eccleſiaſtical, but Civil Officers, they act not by an Eccleſiaſtical Authority, but are Miniſters of the Regal Power in Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, as I have already ſhewn; and therefore if their Union under one Prince, cannot make them one Church, much leſs can their Union under the King's Miniſters.

2. Suppoſe they were true Primitive Biſhops, yet where there are ſeparate Churches in any Dioceſs, they cannot all live in Communion with their Biſhop, and therefore cannot be one Church. For Communion with the Biſhop

ſhop is eſſential to the notion and unity of an Epiſcopal Church, as I have proved in the Defence. A ſuperviſing Power, not to govern the Church according to his own Judgment and Conſcience; but to ſee, that they govern themſelves according to their own Forms and Models, is no Epiſcopal Authority, much leſs any Act of Church-Communion. Thoſe only communicate with their Biſhop, who ſubmit to his Paſtoral Authority, and partake with him in all Religious Offices, and thoſe who do not, according to the notion of the Catholick Church, are Schiſmaticks, and therefore not of the ſame Church with him. It is a very different thing to be a meer Viſitor and a Biſhop, and it is as different a thing to be in Communion with a Biſhop, and to be ſubject to the Viſitations of the King's Eccleſiaſtical Miniſter; and therefore a ſuperviſing Power cannot make thoſe one Church, who are of different Communions.

Cap. 7.

Defence, p 469. &c.

3. If Mr. *H.*'s Project ſhould take, to make ſome leading Diſſenters Biſhops, it is ſtill more evident, that they could in no ſenſe make a National Church, becauſe the Biſhops of the

Cap. 7. Church would be of different Communions, For it is the Communion of Biſhops with one another, which unite all their Churches into a National, Patriarchal, or Catholick Church, as I have proved in the Defence. This is abundantly enough to ſhew, that Mr. *H.*'s Epiſcopal Viſiters, cannot make a National Church.

Ibid. cap. 7. 8.

4. Another way Mr. *H.* propoſes, to unite all theſe Churches into one National Church, is by the Vertue of *occaſional Communion. That when a man hath his choice to be of one Church, which he will, in regard to fixed Communion, he ſhould occaſionally come alſo to the other, for maintaining this National Union.*

But, 1. No occaſional Acts of Communion can unite Churches of diſtinct and ſeparate Communions. To be in Communion with a Church, is to be a member of it; no man ought to communicate with any Church, of which he is not a Member, and no Acts of Communion can unite Churches, which do not make them Members of each other, as I have alſo proved in the Defence; and therefore ſuch occaſional Acts of Communion, can contribute nothing to a National Union.

Ibid. p 132. &c.

2. Of

2. Of what nature ſhall this occaſional Communion be? Shall they communicate in all Acts of Worſhip, or only hear a Sermon now and then together? If in all Acts of Worſhip, why ſhould there be diſtinct Communions at any time? Why cannot he communicate always with that Church, with which he can communicate in all Acts of Worſhip ſome times? If our occaſional Communion be only in ſome few leſs material Acts, this makes no Union of Churches; for if there be any Acts of Worſhip, wherein they can at no time communicate with each other, no man will ſay ſuch Churches are united in one Communion. Cap. 7.

3. What is the meaning of this *ſhould*: would Mr. *H.* have an Act of Parliament to enjoyn this occaſional Communion; and what will this differ from an Act of Uniformity? For it requires Uniformity ſometimes, and if Uniformity be ſometimes lawful, why ſhould it not be made always neceſſary? If Mr. *H.* by *ſhould*— only intimates, what he would have them do, what then, if they won't, notwithſtanding his *ſhould*? What will become of this National Union then? This occaſional Communion is either

Cap. 7. neceſſary to this National Union, or it is not. If it be not neceſſary, why does Mr. *H.* make this an expedient for National Union? If it be, how will he prove, that all Diſſenters will occaſionally communicate with each other, and with the Church of *England*?

3. Mr. H.'s project for Union, will cure no one Schiſm, and therefore can make no Union. This is evident from what I have already diſcours'd; for if it cannot make one Church, it cannot cure the Schiſm; where there are two diſtinct and ſeparate Churches, which are not Members of each other, there is a Schiſm; for Church-Unity conſiſts in one Communion, as I have abundantly proved in the Defence. Should Mr. *H.*'s Materials for Union be confirmed by Act of Parliament, it would be neither better nor worſe, than either an Univerſal, or a limited Toleration, (as they can agree that matter among themſelves) eſtabliſhed by Law. Nay, ſhould ſuch an Act declare, that all ſuch ſeparate Churches ſhould be parts of the National Church; the Power of Parliaments may certainly alter the ſignification of words, but it cannot alter the Nature of things. They would

Defence, chap. 4.

would ſtill be as many Churches as they are now, but could never be one Church, though they might be called a National Church, as that may be made to ſignifie all the Churches of profeſſed Chriſtians in the Nation eſtabliſhed by Law. Such an Act of Parliament would deliver the Diſſenters from temporal Puniſhments, and might deliver them from the ſin of Diſobedience to Civil Governors; but the guilt of Schiſm will remain ſtill, unleſs he thinks, that the Donatiſts were not Schiſmaticks, when *Julian* the Apoſtate with an uniting Deſign, granted a general Toleration. So that this Project may ſecure the Eſtates, but cannot ſecure the Souls of Diſſenters; Schiſm will damn men, though they ſhould get it eſtabliſhed by Act of Parliament; but Mr. *H.* and I, I perceive, have very different deſigns, and therefore no wonder, if our Materials for Union differ: He is concerned for this World, I am concerned for the next. He would ſecure Diſſenters from all Trouble and Moleſtation here, which I am by no means againſt, as far as it may be done, with the ſecurity of the Church and State, and honour of Religion; but if it were in Cap. 7.

my

Cap. 7. my Power, I would Sacrifice my eaſe and quiet, and all that is dear to me in this World, to ſecure their immortal Intereſts, which no humane Power can ſecure, while they live in Schiſm.

But Mr. *H.* thinks, he has found out a device to cure the Schiſm, *viz.* That *it ſhould be decreed in the Convocation, that neither Church ſhould un-church one another.* This is a wonderful Power he gives to the Decree of a Convocation; that Churches, which ſeparate from each others Communion, yet ſhall not un-church one another. For what does he mean by *un-churching*? To aſſert the Communion of any Church to be ſinful and unlawful, I think, is to un-church it, that is, to make it no Church to us; and whoever ſeparates from any Church, though he be never ſo ſilent, does by his Separation, either condemn the Communion of that Church to be unlawful, or condemn himſelf of Schiſm, for nothing can juſtifie a Separation, but ſinful terms of Communion. How is it poſſible then, that two Churches, which ſeparate from each other, ſhould not un-church one another, or un-church themſelves. There is but one Church, and one Communion, and there-

therefore where there are two ſeparate Churches, and two Communions, they cannot both be true Catholick Churches; and Mr. *H.*'s contrivance to declare theſe ſeparate Churches, to be all true Catholick Churches by the Decree of Convocation, is like his Act of Parliament, to make all the ſeparate and divided Churches one National Church. Cap. 7.

4. Mr. *H.*'s Project is not a very likely way, ſo much as to preſerve the external Peace and Union of the Nation; and if it be not good for this, it is certainly good for nothing. We ſee, how troubled and diſturbed the State of the Nation is at this day, occaſioned by the Diſputes of Religion; how envenomed their Spirits are, how furious and factious their Zeal; now not to enlarge upon this unpleaſant Theme, which poſſibly may be called railing; I would only ask Mr. *H.* whether ſuch an Act of Parliament, as he dreams of, would heal any differences in Religion, would make the Diſſenters think better of one another, or of the Church of *England*, than now they do? Would make them more Loyal in their Principles, more Charitable to one another, more cool and temperate in their Zeal? Whether ſuch an

Cap. 7. an Act could ſet bounds to the ſeveral Sects among us, and make them contented with their own private Perſwaſions, and with the Liberties and Priviledges, which the Law grants them, without encroaching upon their Neighbours, or affecting Rule and Dominion, and uſing all imaginable Arts to make Proſelytes, and enlarge their Party? This is the Original of all our Diſturbance now, and what hope is there, when the Cauſe remains, that the Effect will ceaſe? If men ſtill have the ſame fondneſs for their own Opinions and Churches, the ſame Averſion to others, the ſame Zeal to promote a Party; if ſtill they think themſelves as much bound as ever, to advance the Cauſe of God, and to ſet Chriſt on his Throne, according to their old pretence, how fond is it to imagine, that we ſhall enjoy more Peace and Security, than we do now?

If it be anſwered, that the Diſſenters are at preſent uneaſie and troubleſom, becauſe the Laws are againſt them, and they are in conſtant danger of the execution of them, to the loſs of their Liberties, and the impoveriſhing their Families, but if they had the ſame favour, and the ſame ſecurity from the Government, as others

others have, they would be as quiet and peaceable, and as dutiful Subjects, as others are. I reply, Cap. 7.

1. It does not seem very probable, that those, who are so Insolent, Daring, and Factious, when the Laws and Government are against them, should grow modest and governable, when the Law is on their side. If they cannot be governed with the Bridle in their mouths, it is hard trusting to their good Nature.

For, 2. We have had sufficient experience, how busie, turbulent, and factious the Spirit of *Fanaticism* has always been, and we see no Symptoms of their changing for the better.

3. We know by experience, how impossibly it is to oblige these men by any favours. The kindness and moderation of Government is always thought a just debt to their great merit and desert, or the effect of fear and weakness, or the over-ruling Power of God, who turns the hearts of Governors to favour his People, even against their own Inclinations, and therefore no thanks is due to them.

Impossible to oblige Dissenters by Favours. 338

4. These men never yet let slip an advantage and opportunity to disturb Government, or to serve their Cause. Every

Cap. 7. ry thing, that is granted them, gives them only a new confidence to ask and to demand more. And if ever they can ſtand upon equal ground with the Church of *England*, they will as boldly challenge a Superiority, and be as much diſobliged, if they be denyed. If once they get a legal Rite to their Conventicles, they will next demand the Temples and Tythes too, and declaim againſt the Magiſtrates as Sacrilegious Uſurpers, if they be denyed. Their Diſcipline will not long be confined within their own Conventicles, will reach Biſhops and Princes too, whoſe Authority ſhall be no longer owned, than they ſubmit to the Scepter of Chriſt. Theſe things are not yet forgot among us, and I ſuppoſe, it will be hard to perſwade any Prince to make a ſecond Experiment, when he paid ſo dear for the firſt.

5. We have made a ſad Experiment already, how tame and gentle Diſſenters prove, when the reſtraints of Laws are gone. When the Church of *England* was diſſolved, and the encloſures flung open, and every man did as he liſt, there was no more Peace, than there is now, only inſtead of railing at the Church of *England*, they railed at one another. But enough of this. Mr.

Mr. *H.* thinks all this will be prevented by his Episcopal Visiters, who are to see, *that the Churches of both sorts walk according to their own Order, and the Peace of one another.* Cap. 7.

But, 1. Who shall undertake, that all these Churches shall quietly submit to these Visiters, and quietly obey their Orders, any more than they do to the Visitation of their Ordinaries now? And what means of Union is there left, if they don't?

2. Who shall undertake, that these Visiters themselves shall not prove factious and partial, and secretly foment, instead of suppressing Disputes and Quarrels between the Churches, for the Visiters are to be of all sorts too, as well as the Churches; *Independent*, *Presbyterian*, and *Episcopal* Visiters, by the name of the King's Bishops, or Ecclesiastical Officers? now I doubt Episcopal Churches would find no great comfort in the Visitation of such *Independent* and *Presbyterian* Visiters, as Dr. *Owen* and Mr. *Baxter*; I confess for my own part, I should not much care to come under their Visitation. And I will not answer for all Episcopal Visiters, that they shall always carry an equal hand to Dissenters. As for Instance.

Mr. *H.* says, *That no Members of either Church should depart from one Church to another, without a sufficient peaceable Reason.* Now who must be Judge of this, but the Visiter? Suppose then, a Member of a Presbyterian Church think fit to return to the Episcopal Church, do you think, that a Presbyterian Visiter will be easily satisfied, that he has a peaceable and sufficient Reason for this? Will not every Visiter

Cap. 7. ſiter be greatly inclined to favour and enlarge the Communion of that Church, to which he himſelf belongs? And what Quarrels is this like to occaſion between the ſeveral Churches? It may be much greater, than any thing elſe has yet done.

But the great Tryal of Skill will be in the promoting of theſe Viſiters. For though the King have the Nomination and Appointment of them, their Ordination being only a broad Seal (a new way of Conſecrating Biſhops) yet what Art will be uſed by the different Churches in the Dioceſs, to get a Viſiter of their own Communion? What a task will the King have to pleaſe all theſe ſeveral Intereſts? What a noiſe and clamour will the Diſſenters raiſe (who know how to take every occaſion for that) if they have not a diſſenting Viſiter? Nay, it will not be enough then, that he is a Diſſenter in general, but he muſt be a *Preſbyterian* or *Independent* Diſſenter, according to the Intereſts of theſe ſeveral Churches. This will be a perpetual occaſion of Quarrel, and every Party will think themſelves injured and diſobliged, who have not a Viſiter of their own Communion.

Theſe are Mr. *H.*'s Materials for Union, and if Princes and Parliaments think fit to make the Experiment, I cannot help it. But I will venture to turn Prophet for once, and foretel, that they will ſoon find Reaſon to repent the Experiment.

FINIS.